DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 646 EA 024 088

TITLE	Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: 1990-91. Status Report.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 92
NOTE	97p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Innovation; *Learning Activities; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; School Activities; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Third-year outcomes of Re:Learning, a national collaborative effort to redesign the total school system, are presented in this report. The introduction describes the rationale underlying the preparation of the status report and describes the project. The next section describes the 1990-91 activities of Pennsylvania's nine Re:Learning development sites. Each school site description includes a brief demographic profile of the school district, an overview of site activities, and description of the following components: leadership, management, and support; building understanding, commitment, and capacity; major activities; outcomes; enablers and barriers; and anticipated activities. The summary concludes that progress was made in the following areas: reorganization of school schedules, increased student participation in learning, and the development of interdisciplinary courses or projects. Central office staff and board support was a crucial enabler, and barriers were presented by noninvolved staff, monetary resources, and time constraints. Issues related to the organizational contexts being provided in support of Re:Learning are discussed: organizational commitment; strategies for achieving the program vision; and resources. The appendix contains a summary of Muncey and McQuillan's 5-year ethnographic study of several Coalition of Essential Schools. (10 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347646

RE:LEARNING IN PENNSYLVANIA:
1990-91 STATUS REPORT

Research for Better Schools, Inc.

with assistance from

The Pennsylvania Department of Education,
Pennsylvania's Re:Learning Development Sites, and
The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

February 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE:LEARNING IN PENNSYLVANIA:

1990-91 STATUS REPORT

Research for Better Schools, Inc.

with assistance from

The Pennsylvania Department of Education,

Pennsylvania's Re:Learning Development Sites

The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching

February 1992

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education to be the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory, serving Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia. as one of ten federally-supported regional educational laboratories, RBS' mission for the past 25 years has been to collaborate with state, intermediate, and local educational agencies to improve district, school, and classroom practice. RBS is a non-profit corporation, governed by a Board of Directors made up of educational and community leaders from its region.

The RBS work involved in developing this publication was funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development of this status report was a collaborative effort. Ms. Jean di Sabatino, the Pennsylvania Re:Learning State Coordinator, commissioned the preparation of the report on behalf of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), and contributed background information on PDE's Re:Learning activities. The Coordinator of Higher Education Re:Learning Facilitators, Dr. Dennis Denenberg of Millersville University, also contributed background information on the state's effort to link higher education institutions with the Re:Learning initiative. Special thanks are in order to the above individuals for their support in this endeavor.

Particular thanks are extended to the following Re:Learning Teacher Coordinators (RL-TC) and staff from Pennsylvania's Re:Learning development sites:

- Ms. Susan Robb (RL-TC) and Mr. John Ziegler (RL TREK Trainer), Bellefonte Area High School, Bellefonte Area School District
- Ms. Rose Marie Montgomery (RL-TC), Central Bucks East High School, Central Bucks School District
- Ms. Pamela Cressman (RL-TC), Central Bucks West High School, Central Bucks School District
- Ms. Carol Kelsall (RL-TC), Garden Spot Junior High School, Eastern Lancaster County School District
- Mr. Gene Hale (RL-TC), Garden Spot Senior High School, Eastern Lancaster County School District
- Mr. Richard Wilson (RL-TC), Elizabethtown High School, Elizabethtown Area School District
- Mr. Robert Anderson (Principal and RL Facilitator), New Hope-Solebury Junior-Senior High School, New Hope-Solebury School District
- Ms. Cathy Schrader (RL-TC), Alternative for the Middle Years School (AMY-6), Sub-District Six of the School District of Philadelphia
- Mr. Neil Smith (Principal), Ms. Marion Homer (Assistant Principal and RL Coordinator), Ms. Janet Kelly ("Voc-Tech" Director), and Ms. Carol Hollenbaugh and Ms. Patricia Hovan (Teachers), Tyrone Junior-Senior High School, Tyrone Area School District.

Representing their respective Re:Learning sites, each of the above individuals or small groups of individuals participated in a three-hour interview conducted by Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) to describe their 1990-91 Re:Learning activities and their perceptions of their progress. They are to be particularly commended for their participation in the interview process, and for their efforts in reviewing the final draft of the report.

Finally, thanks are extended to Richard McCann and John Hopkins of RBS for their substantial editorial assistance. Thanks are also extended to Patricia Matthews of RBS for producing this report and moving it through its multiple word processing iterations.

Edward M. Patrick
Research for Better Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Status Report Rationale	1
Description of Re:Learning	1
Overview of Re:Learning in Pennsylvania	2
Organizational Format of the Report	6
BELLEFONTE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT: BELLEFONTE AREA HIGH SCHOOL	7
CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT: EAST HIGH SCHOOL	17
CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT: WEST HIGH SCHOOL	27
EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	35
EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	43
ELIZABETHTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT: ELIZABETHTOWN HIGH SCHOOL	49
NEW HOPE-SOLEBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT: JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	57
SUB-DISTRICT SIX OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA: ALTERNATIVE FOR THE MIDDLE YEARS SCHOOL (AMY-6)	65
TYRONE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT: TYRONE JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	75
SUMMARY AND REFLECTIONS	85
REFERENCES	91
APPENDIX	93

INTRODUCTION

This introduction describes the rationale underlying the preparation of this status report, presents a description of Re:Learning, provides an overview of Pennsylvania's 1990-91 Re:Learning activities, and describes the common organizational format used to present the 1990-91 activities of Pennsylvania's nine Re:Learning development sites.

Status Report Rationale

Since late 1988, considerable state and school/district energies have been devoted to implementing Re:Learning in Pennsylvania. Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: A Status Report (October 1990), provided a description of Pennsylvania state and district activities during the first two years (1988-89 and 1889-90 school years) of the Re:Learning initiative. This report provides an overview of the state's activities in the third year of the project, and presents detailed descriptions of the activities of the nine school sites involved in the "development" phase of Re:Learning. A summary of the progress made by the development sites, and reflections on those factors which seemed to either facilitate or constrain their progress are offered at the conclusion of the report. Overall, the report documents Pennsylvania's progress, so that it might be shared with other interested parties.

Description of Re:Learning

Re:Learning is a national effort to redesign the total school system. It is based on Theodore Sizer's (1984) nine common principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), as stated in Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. It reflects the belief that if schools are to achieve their primary purpose -- to help all students learn to use their minds well -- participants at all levels of education, from the state house to the school house, must be engaged in a focused and coordinated effort. The title Re:Learning represents the partnership formed in late 1987 between the Educational Commission of the States and the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). Their goal was to help educators rethink the pedagogies, curricula, structures, and environments of education toward to the end of helping all students learn to use their minds well. Hence, the title captures the bottom line, "changes with regard to learning," and how learning can be facilitated or strengthened in schools.

ECS and CES are working jointly to disseminate and support this restructuring initiative. One key aspect of the joint venture has been to influence states to engage in the Re:Learning movement. ECS' role in this partnership has been to work with governors, legislators, and policymakers, while CES staff work with schools. To date, seven states are participating in Re:Learning: Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. In addition to its Re:Learning partnership with ECS, the Coalition (CES) continues to exist as a separate school-university partnership with some 100 secondary schools committed to implementing Sizer's principles.

There is no correct model or "canned program" to implement in Re:Learning. Rather, it consists of a process wherein each particpating school decides how it will go about adapting CES' nine principles to its specific context. In that regard, Re:Learning school staff work to create schools that have:

- an intellectual focus geared toward helping students use their minds well
- simple goals wherein students master a limited number of essential skills and knowledge
- universal goals that apply to all students
- personalized teaching/learning procedures, and site-based instructional decisionmaking
- students engaged as workers learning-to-learn, with teachers playing a coaching role
- diplomas awarded upon successful exhibitions of mastery of essential skills and knowledge
- climates or tones that reflect trust, strong expectations, fairness and mutual respect
- staff engaged in multiple roles as generalists first and specialists second
- budgets wherein per-pupil-costs are no more than ten percent above those of traditional schools.

Re:Learning has placed a number of conditions on both states and schools which must be met before they can be recognized officially as Re:Learning states/schools. These conditions involve a state commitment to allocate time (5 years), dollars, staff, and a leadership structure that will support the implementation of the nine common principles in at least ten schools in a given state. At the district/school level, a school's faculty must choose to participate in Re:Learning, and district/school staff must commit the time, staff, and resources needed to engage in extensive study, planning, development, and implementation to redesign the school based on CES' principles over a multi-year period.

Overview of Re:Learning in Pennsylvania

This overview presents a brief review of the first two years of Pennsylvania's involvement in Re:Learning, and describes Pennsylvania state, district, and higher education agency Re:Learning-goals and activities in the third year (1990-91) of the initiative.

Re:Learning in Pennsylvania

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) commenced its investigation of Re:Learning in August 1988, and officially became a Re:Learning state

in July 1989. In the first two years of its involvement in Re:Learning (i.e., summer of 1988 through the summer of 1990), PDE established a management structure for Re:Learning; appointed a full-time Re:Learning state coordinator; established a state cadre and an advisory committee; sponsored a variety of Re:Learning-related awareness, training, and networking workshops or meetings for interested and involved school districts; provided annual "seed" monies, commencing in the fall of 1989, to school districts that committed to participating in Re:Learning (i.e., ten school sites in eight districts in the early part of 1989, and twelve more school sites in eight additional districts in 1990.); engaged in a partnership with the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching (PAPT) to foster both district and higher education involvement in Re:Learning; promoted Re:Learning both within PDE and across the state; and collaborated intensively with representatives of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) and the Education Commission of the States (ECS).

State Goals and Activities in 1990-91

PDE's goals for the third year of the project were to continue to provide financial and technical support to participating districts/schools; increase statewide interest in Re:Learning; increase the involvement of higher education in the initiative, particularly with regard to pre-service teacher preparation; expand efforts to obtain private sector involvement and funding; begin to integrate Re:Learning's activities with those of other bureaus in the department; and increase awareness of the initiative among state legislators. The 1990-91 state Re:Learning plan outlined a wide range of proposed activities to address the above goals.

The primary responsibility for accomplishing the state's goals and carrying out the day-to-day operations of the Re:Learning initiative at the state level rested with the Re:Learning state coordinator, Ms. Jean di Sabatino. Among other activities, the state coordinator administered the funds provided by PDE to participating districts. In that regard, PDE provided the following levels of funding support to Re:Learning districts in 1990-91: $14,000 to each of the eight original districts, $7,000 to each of the twelve districts that joined in 1990, and $3,000 to three districts to engage in exploratory activities.

The Re:Learning state coordinator sponsored several professional development and/or networking activities for district Re:Learning staff. Specifically, she sponsored three one-day "conversation" meetings (one for teachers, one for principals, and a combined teacher-principal meeting); organized a week-long, summer curriculum institute for cross-discipline teams of Re:Learning staff, designed to guide the participants through a backward planning process for writing interdisciplinary curriculum based on essential questions and student outcomes; and sponsored a six-day TREK designed to build a school staff's capacity to effect local change. All of the above activities were designed to include teams of people, be highly participatory, include time to discuss issues and team strategies, provide cumulative experiences, and provide opportunities for camaraderie.

The Re:Learning state coordinator also conducted three meetings of the state advisory committee; cultivated support for Re:Learning across other PDE

work units; obtained a small grant from the Southwest Bell Education Foundation which was used to send several PDE staff to a policymakers' seminar on "improving communications;" interacted with the press; maintained close liaisons with CES, ECS, and PAPT staff; and interacted extensively with school district staff engaged in Re:Learning.

With respect to this last activity, the Re:Learning state coordinator made it a point to visit all Re:Learning sites in the state at least once in 1990-91, and multiple visits were made to many of the sites. On a number of the site visits, the coordinator was accompanied by a Coalition and/or an ECS staff person. The major purposes of the visits were to provide encouragement and personal support for the schools, become acquainted with the activities in which they were engaged, provide technical/networking assistance, and act as a "critical friend." The coordinator and her CES and ECS associates usually provided suggestions to school staff, when asked. They preferred using a socratic approach when asked for assistance, and typically posed questions or offered suggestions aimed at helping school participants clarify, define, and solve their own problems.

The state's priorities for 1991-92 are to: continue to fiscally and technically support 23 Re:Learning schools; increase statewide interest in Re:Learning, and spread the message that the school's primary mission is to help children learn how to learn; integrate and coordinate higher education's involvement in Re:Learning to ensure that new teachers will come to schools ready to help children learn to learn; extend efforts to expand Re:Learning by seeking private sector support, leadership, and funding; continue to build upon the integration of Re:Learning principles into other bureaus and initiatives within PDE; and develop a coalition of key educational associations willing to support schools' restructuring activities.

District Goals and Activities in 1990-91

The goals and activities of the districts involved in Re:Learning varied, generally according to their length of involvement in the initiative. Generally, speaking, the districts and school sites in their third year of Re:Learning ("development sites") tended to focus primarily on goals and activities related to reorganizing school schedules, forming and piloting teams of two to four teachers to work with assigned groups of students, developing and piloting an interdisciplinary curriculum, modifying traditional approaches to instruction, experimenting with exhibitions of student performance, expanding faculty involvement in Re:Learning, and building staff capacity. Collectively, these Re:Learning "development" sites seemed to make the most progress on the CES principles of student-as-worker and personalization of teaching and learning.

The majority of the districts and school sites in their second year of Re:Learning ("study sites") tended to focus on goals and activities related to the further study and exploration of Re:Learning. Typically, they engaged in some or all of the following exploratory and study activities. The districts sent participants to the state-sponsored Re:Learning meetings; appointed Re:Learning coordinators/directors; formed planning, working and/or steering committees; introduced CES principles to the staff, board, and community through various presentations; purchased CES-related texts and materials; conducted small and large group faculty discussions on the nine CES principles

and their potential applications; engaged in self-study activities; sent staff to visit one or more CES schools; planned and implemented CES-related workshops and presentations; worked at developing board, administrative, and staff commitment; made preliminary decisions about the focus that Re:Learning would take in their district, and how it would relate to their needs and goals; and developed action plans for the coming year.

Higher Education Agency Goals and Activities

From its inception, the Re:Learning initiative in Pennsylvania has been viewed as a collaborative effort between basic education and higher education. In essence, as schools and the roles of teachers change, so, too, must the programs which prepare future educators. With this end in mind, the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching (PAPT) provided small grants to staff from colleges and universities involved in teacher preparation, to stimulate their interest in Re:Learning to the end of having them examine its implications for teacher preparation.

Specifically, in 1989, the Re:Learning state coordinator encouraged Re:Learning districts to invite proximate higher education colleagues to join in their discussions of Re:Learning. Following up on this action, the executive director of PAPT made arrangements with staff from six colleges and universities across the state to "partner-up" with districts involved in Re:Learning. These higher education Re:Learning liaisons, or facilitators, were viewed as "partners in change" and not consultants, per se.

In September 1990, Dr. Dennis Denenberg of Millersville University was asked by the executive director of PAPT to coordinate this Higher Education/Re:Learning (HE/RL) initiative. The goals of the HE/RL initiative in 1990-91 were: to organize a group of interested higher education liaisons and bring them together for planning sessions, work with the liaisons in planning how to implement CES' principles on their campuses, and promote the HE/RL initiative. Accordingly, the HE/RL coordinator conducted three day-long meetings of the higher education liaison group (November 1990, and February and June 1991); organized and co-presented with the Re:Learning state coordinator, a presentation on Re:Learning for all fourteen State System of Higher Education (SSHE) field directors; submitted presentation proposals to the Pennsylvania Association of Teacher Educator's and the National Association of Teacher Educator's annual conferences; participated in a week-long ECS/CES-sponsored Re:Learning Strategy Institute; served as a liaison with three Re:Learning districts; engaged in planning for 1991-92; and routinely promoted the HE/RL initiative at a variety of meetings and through personal professional contacts.

It was the HE/RL coordinator's assessment that the goals of organizing the higher education liaisons and promoting the initiative were successfully met in 1990-91. Staff from ten institutions of higher education exhibited serious interest in Re:Learning through their participation in the liaison group meetings. More modest inroads were made, however, with regard to having the institutions of higher education incorporate CES' principals into their teacher education programs; three of the cooperating universities initiated work in this goal area. In retrospect, the achievement of this latter goal will likely be a multi-stage, multi-year endeavor.

The HE/RL initiative's goals for 1991-92 are: continue to develop communications between basic and higher education, increase the number of institutions of higher education committed to Re:Learning, continue higher education/school district liaison activities, work with key higher education associations and individuals to increase their understanding of Re:Learning, continue work and support efforts (seminars, workshops, etc.) leading to the inclusion of Re:Learning's principles in teacher preparation programs, and plan research and evaluation activities.

Organizational Format of the Report

A common format was used to describe the 1990-91 activities of each of the nine Pennsylvania school sites engaged in the "development" phase of Re:Learning. Each school site description is introduced by a brief "demographic profile" of the school district, followed by an "overview" of the site's activities. The body of each site description then addresses the following:

- Leadership, Management, and Support
  - -- Committee Structure
  - -- Teacher Coordinator's Role
  - -- Administrative Support
  - -- Financial Support
  - -- Reflections
- Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity
- Major Activities
- Effects of Re:Learning
- Enablers and Barriers
- Anticipated Activities.

It should be noted that seven school districts were involved in the "development" phase of Re:Learning. Two of these districts have two schools participating; hence, the nine sites. Given the format for the report, the descriptions for the schools from the same district are introduced by the same demographic profile and some common overview material.

Additionally, the abbreviation "RL" is used in place of "Re:Learning" throughout the descriptions for the sake of brevity.

BELLEFONTE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT:
BELLEFONTE AREA HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 4 elementary, 1 middle, 1 high school

Student Enrollment: 2,684 (growing slightly)

Student Population: 98 percent white, 1 percent black, 1 percent Hispanic

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $4,823

Number of Teachers: 76 elementary, 113 middle and secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1	Superintendent	13	Department Heads
5	Principals	2	Directors
2	Assistant Principals	1	Manager of Information Systems
3	Supervisors or Coordinators		

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

High school, grades 9-12, 807 students, 62 teachers

High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Ninth grade team, 4 teachers, 80 students
Tenth grade team, 6 teachers (planning for 1991-92)
Humanities course, 2 teachers, 36 students
ACT program, all staff and students involved

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

Much effort has been expended at the elementary school level in addressing the Pennsylvania Comprehensive Reading Program (PCRP II) and a whole language program.

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

Budgets, their accompanying tax increases, and personnel changes are the most recent controversial issues.

Description of the Community:

The Bellefonte Area School District is a small town/rural community very close to the campus of the Pennsylvania State University. There is a wide range of socioeconomic levels. The aid ratio is approximately .58 and the total effort is 21.6 mills on market value.

Overview

Bellefonte was one of the first of the Pennsylvania Re:Learning (RL) sites to elect a teacher coordinator (TC) to play a lead role in managing its RL initiative. Bellefonte's RL activities are managed largely by the TC, acting in concert with the school staff, the RL committees, the high school principal, and central office administrators. Teachers' participation in RL is voluntary. The RL initiative was formally enacted only after a majority of the faculty approved the school's participation by ballot in the Spring of 1990. Major proposed RL activities are still voted on by the school faculty, and are enacted only upon obtaining faculty approval. Of the sixty-five teachers in the high school, approximately 18-20 (about 30 percent) are actively involved in RL at this time.

Key RL pilot implementation activities in the 1990-91 school year included: the formation and implementation of a ninth grade teaching team; the creation and implementation of a team-taught senior humanities course; and the implementation of an Active Communication Time (ACT) student advisory proposal to enhance the personalization of school and learning. Related accomplishments included: increased involvement with the parents of the students on the ninth grade team, and the students taking the humanities course; and formal pilot work on student exhibition activities in the humanities course.

Proposed 1991-92 school year implementation activities include the continuation of the ninth grade team and the humanities course, and the addition of a tenth grade team. Due to a lack of faculty support, the ACT advisory activity will be dropped.

Leadership, Management, and Support

Bellefonte's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. Reflections on the progress to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also cited.

Committee Structure

Re:Learning is guided by a district steering committee, formed in the spring of 1989, composed of three administrators, a board member, two parents, and five teachers. Although active in the 1989-90 school year, this committee did not meet in the 1990-91 school year. The RL planning committee, chaired by the TC, is the committee that directs the day-to-day operations of RL in the district. This latter committee, composed of seven teachers, has generally met monthly since its inception in the fall of 1989. The planning committee is responsible for: proposing and implementing major RL activities, developing a dialogue with and among faculty about RL, communicating with all vested interest groups, submitting proposals for board approval, providing for an assessment of project impact, and deciding on "those things that need to be put to a faculty vote" (i.e., issues that affect the faculty at large). Planning committee meetings are open, and school staff are encouraged to attend.

Three sub-committees grew out of the planning committee. The research and development committee, composed of two administrators and two teachers, kept up on the latest information (tools and articles) on student assessment and evaluation. The budget committee, which consists of a chairperson, monitored RL-related spending, kept track of teacher hours and related paperwork, and interacted with the planning committee to form budget projections. Finally, the ACT committee, which consists of five teachers, oversaw the implementation of the student advisory program. Each of the sub-committees is or was chaired by a member of the planning committee.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

Bellefonte is unique in that (for all practical purposes) it has had since the fall of 1989 two TCs; one that was officially elected and a second that has served as a de facto co-TC. The latter teacher will likely be elected to the co-TC role during the 1991-92 school year. The change to a formal co-coordinator structure is reflective of the demands of managing RL's implementation. The TC's formal role involves: chairing the planning committee, monitoring RL activities within the school, coordinating out-of-school activities (e.g., workshops, travel), being a member of every other RL committee and the district strategic planning committee, and coordinating visitors to the school -- in addition to teaching.

The TC indicated strongly that the demands of the TC role escalate as the implementation of RL expands. She also noted that the tasks and the time involved in handling the many visitors to Bellefonte's "lighthouse RL activities" was almost a half-time job in 1990-91.

Administrative Support

The superintendent and board have been quite supportive of RL in Bellefonte. To quote the TC, the board originally said: "This (RL) looks good, try it out." That has changed to: "This is working, and we want you to go ahead and continue to grow."

The only area that was somewhat problematic in the past year was the level of support offered by the high school principal, who recently relocated to another district. According to the TC, the principal attested to his support of RL in private to those actively involved, but did not offer his support in front of the entire faculty. The TC felt the principal's "kind of hands-off, no risk, middle-of-the-road approach to RL" had a less than positive effect on RL.

Financial Support

In the 1989-90 school year, Bellefonte spent $35,000 on RL, $25,000 of which was provided by PDE. The district projected that $40,000 would be needed for 1990-91. Of that amount, $14,000 was received from PDE and the district supplied the balance. It is estimated that two-thirds of the 1990-91 RL monies were expended on program development (i.e., compensation for additional teacher time to work on RL), and one-third on other related activities (e.g., substitutes, travel, materials, and conference/workshop registration and attendance). Money, per se, was not viewed as a problem. The

superintendent and business manager, according to the TC, "made sure that RL's needs were covered."

Reflections

The TC and co-TC offered the following reflections on leadership and support. They thought that they had made a little progress in expanding the shared leadership of the RL initiative this year by involving additional teachers. They noted, as evidence, the addition of six tenth grade teachers, who will be active this summer and fall on the tenth grade team.

They felt the level of interaction and communication this year among district and school administrators and the planning team went "down hill a little." That is, there seemed to be less time to interact with the administration over "project specifics," and the steering committee's input and support was missed in that it did not meet in 1990-91. The building principal's lack of overt support was also seen as a constraint. They were optimistic, however, that the arrival of a new high school principal, a CES advocate, would contribute to the momentum of RL.

Overall, they noted: "We're holding our own, and we haven't lost anyone." They did indicate, however, there was an ongoing level of tension among the faculty involved in RL and those not involved.

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

The planning committee modified its approach this year to building faculty understanding and commitment to RL. Last year (1989-90), the focus was on RL newsletters and whole-faculty luncheons. The publicity given to district RL participants in the newsletter, however, seemed to cause resentment among some of the faculty. In 1990-91, this approach was toned down. Only one RL newsletter was published. Instead of promoting RL through faculty luncheon dialogues and written communications, the committee decided to let the work of those involved in RL speak for itself. They also attempted to recognize the work of non-RL teachers involved in innovative class activities by having RL project visitors sit in on non-RL classes as well as RL classes. Systematic outreach efforts to the board and parents also were a priority.

Accordingly, key activities to promote RL in 1990-91 included:

- three information-update presentations to the board during board working sessions
- open invitations to all staff to sit in on the ninth grade team and humanities RL classes "to see it for yourself"
- taking visitors to see teacher lessons involving cooperative learning ("student-as-worker") in classes other other than those identified as RL, in addition to taking them to visit RL classes
- outreach activities to the parents of students involved in the ninth grade team and humanities course, particularly with regard to their attendance at student exhibitions

- presentations to community and business groups
- a half dozen brief RL dialogue sessions with faculty interested in RL during Tuesday afternoon released-time sessions.

In addition, participation in the following staff development activities/events in 1990-91 contributed to Bellefonte's capacity to implement RL:

- five staff attended the CES Fall Forum in St. Louis, Missouri
- the co-TC underwent six days of CES training in order to become a TREK trainer
- project representatives participated in the PDE-sponsored teacher-principal meeting and several teacher conversation meetings
- twenty-two teachers, including several from the middle school, took the district RL inservice-for-credit course offered in conjunction with the intermediate unit
- fifteen high school staff participated in a one-and-one-half day off-site retreat devoted to team building and the curriculum.

Overall, the TC said: "We were busy doing RL and planning ahead this year. We wanted to let the courses develop and then they would speak for themselves." She added, "The only problem in communicating with the community and students is the name of the initiative; Re:Learning sounds remedial." Both the TC and the co-TC also expressed the view that staff development was critical to RL. They indicated that a core group of school staff needs to have a depth of RL-related information and skills, while others need to be exposed to selected training-related events so that there is both "depth and breadth" to a school staff's RL capacity.

Major Activities

Descriptions of the ninth and tenth grade team, humanities course, and ACT activities are provided below.

Ninth Grade Team

The ninth grade team represents Bellefonte's pilot attempt to restructure groupings of teachers and students to personalize teaching/learning and increase the effectiveness of schooling. The team consisted of four teachers: one each in English, social studies, science, and mathematics. These teachers worked with the same 80 students throughout the year, and had the flexibility of scheduling double blocks of time and team teaching. The team's eight, 45-minute period daily schedule consisted of four teaching periods (1-4), a "flex" period (5), a personal planning period (6), a period in which teachers of sister subjects (e.g., science and math) could plan (7), and a common planning period (8) in which all four teachers could plan together. The "flex" period was actually a teaching period in which the teachers on the team engaged in tutorial work with selected students in areas of need (e.g., study

skills, math); it was not a study hall. The fifteen minute student advisory activity also occurred during "flex" time. Periods 6, 7, and 8 were elective periods for the students.

This schedule enabled the ninth grade team to coordinate their teaching activities to a greater degree than was formerly possible, and enabled them to "keep closer track" of their students' behavior and progress. Next year, however, the ninth grade team will have only two planning periods instead of three. They will pick up a duty period (e.g., study hall, lunch). That way, according to the TC, "things will be put back to normal and there will be a fairer distribution of the work among RL and non-RL teachers."

The team also engaged in significant outreach activities to parents. Monthly meetings were held with parents during the year to explain the team's purpose/program, provide updates of progress, and respond to parental questions/concerns.

Tenth Grade Team

This team consists of an English, science, social studies, and math teacher. It also includes two elective teachers in word processing and driver education. The team met in 1991 to develop a proposal for their 1991-92 school year RL activities. The proposal went through the faculty and board in the late spring of 1991. Team curriculum development/coordination work will occur this summer. Of the current 80 ninth graders involved in RL, 48 will go on to receive their instruction from the new tenth grade team. The TC noted, "there were difficulties with scheduling and it was a problem to arrange for them all to go on."

Humanities Course

Co-taught by an English teacher (the TC), and an arts teacher (the co-TC), this RL course involving 36 seniors met daily for a double period throughout the year. Pedagogically, the course focused on students using their minds well; as such, student independent work/inquiry and teacher guidance/coaching was the daily norm. The co-teachers worked with Rick Lear of CES on its conceptualization; a backward planning process was used in designing the course.

The course was set up in thematic strands, each working toward a culminating student exhibition. Students worked in groups of five for their final exhibitions. Each group chose a particular "culture" to study. In each group, each group member studied a different aspect of the culture, and then taught that aspect to the other members of their small group. For their final exhibition, each group put together a presentation which provided a cross-section overview of their culture. The exhibition also included the preparation and sharing of the foods of the culture. Each group conducted its exhibition for a panel composed of the co-teachers, invited parents, a board member, and other students. A multiple scoring system was used. Teachers' ratings of students' exhibition performance carried the greatest weight. Ratings were also offered by anyone viewing the exhibition, and were factored into the final grade. Individual students were also graded on their exhibition-related written reports. Overall, seven evenings of exhibitions

were conducted and videotaped. Five to six students "exhibited" on each occasion.

The humanities course also involved significant outreach activities to parents. The humanities course teachers conducted monthly meetings with parents to discuss the course, RL, and students' involvement (i.e., "student-as-worker"). They also invited parents into the class to give presentations, had them review students' writings, and invited them to the students' evening exhibitions. Overall parent reaction was very favorable.

Active Communication Time (ACT)

Enacted with the 1990-91 school year, the 15-minute "ACT time" during the fifth period was intended to be a time in which all teaching staff could work with smaller groups of assigned students and engage them in "non-threatening" communications. Its purpose was to personalize the relationship between teachers and students, and provide every student with an adult advocate in a non-threatening ungraded situation, thereby improving students' attitudes toward school and the overall "tone" of the school. The TC related that "it didn't work because many of the teachers were not interested in doing it, and had trouble talking with the kids." Additionally, she noted that "some of the kids perceived it as contrived or gamey, and a few teachers even showed movies during the ACT time period instead of attempting to interact at a personal level with the kids."

As the implementation of ACT proceeded during the year, the problems and discontent cited above surfaced. The disposition of ACT was put to a faculty vote in the late spring of 1991 and it was decided that ACT would be terminated instead of being continued in a modified form (i.e., once a week instead of five times a week). It was estimated by the TC that approximately forty percent of the teachers "were for ACT and took it seriously, and sixty percent were against it." Since ACT was associated with RL, the TC noted that "some teachers felt they were unfairly being involved in RL when they chose not to be."

The TC also felt that the principal's lack of overt support for RL played an influential part in the elimination of the ACT program. That is, the principal asked that the homeroom period, which had been reallocated in part to ACT, be reinstated for administrative purposes. The TC also attributed ACT's demise to a lack of planning committee knowledge of board procedures, and she felt that the principal could have been more helpful with the procedures/policy involved in presenting the original ACT proposal to the board.

Effects of Re:Learning

The effects that RL has had to date on staff, students, and parents at Bellefonte are described below. It bears noting that the initiative is in its first year of classroom implementation. Additionally, neither state nor local resources have been allocated for formal project evaluation. As such, no "hard" comparative data, or, for that matter, formal qualitative data are yet available. However, TC and/or co-TC anecdotal perceptions of staff, student, and parent responses to the RL activities are available.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

Quoting Bob Fulghum, the co-TC said, "In education, if there is no trouble make some." He added, "We have a fight going on here. We have teachers talking about education again for the first time. We're stirring the stew again and that's good!" Overall, it was estimated that about 30 percent of the high school staff are actively involved in RL, 60 percent are silent supporters or neutral, and 10 percent are actively against RL. A key point however, is that significant debate over the relevance of past and proposed educational practices is in progress.

Responses to the Ninth Grade Team

The TC and co-TC offered the following anecdotes with regard to the effects of the ninth grade team experience on students and parents. The students on the ninth grade team said they felt they had been learning information in school before; now they were learning ways of using information and working harder. At the end of the year, however, some of the students on the ninth grade team indicated they wanted to get back into the regular track, instead of being a part of the new tenth grade team. Puzzled by the response, school staff called the parents of those who chose not to go on to the tenth grade team. In more than one instance, the parents reported that their child had not informed them of this decision. Their added response was, "Like heck he's not going on (to the tenth grade team); his grades have gone up this year, and he's been working harder." Other students reported they didn't want to go from the ninth to the tenth grade team, because (on the team) you have four teachers who know all about you, and you can't get away with anything.

Responses to the Humanities Course

Similar favorable responses were obtained with regard to students' participation in the RL humanities course. Among the student responses reported by the TC and co-TC were: "Its the hardest course I've ever had, but I really loved it."; "It caused me to think."; "This isn't like school; now I have to work hard and think hard."; "This is a neater way to learn; our opinions are valued and we all get a chance to speak every day."; and "I've changed my mind about things (RL); now I like the idea of learning what I'm learning instead of forgetting it three days later."

The parents also responded favorably to the humanities course. The TC reported they probably had 30 parents in attendance, on the average, at their monthly evening meetings with the parents of the humanities course students. Among the representative parent comments were: "I had no idea my son was interested in poetry, and now he's interested in being a poet."; "There's been a real turnaround in my daughter. She talks about the humanities course every day when she comes home, asks me questions like she never did before, and causes me to think about issues. She's really involved in it."; and "It's great!". The TC added, "The parents were very supportive and gave us a lot of warm fuzzies."

The co-TC who co-taught the humanities course also indicated the following:

> Student as worker was in evidence (in the course) big time, all the time. We almost always answered a question with a question; we opened the door (on student inquiry), instead of closing it. We made students assume the responsibility for their learning. Early in the year, the students tended to ask lower level questions. As the year progressed, they started asking higher order questions which we typically responded to with further questions. Don't get the wrong idea though. We didn't do it to just play with kids' heads, per se. We wanted to cause them to think, and we did. Initially, some of the students had problems, because they had to think and support their ideas with proof and substantiation. As the year wore on though, they adjusted and met our expectations. We also really got to know the students a lot better. Having co-teachers really worked well and appealed to the students. In the course evaluation toward the end of the year, students said, "This isn't a class, it's a family."

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as important enablers were: the commitment of the teachers involved in RL, both to the students and in the support they gave to each other; the strong board and superintendent support; the monies received from the state and the district; the very encouraging responses and feedback from parents and from students involved in RL; the networking/support system set up by the state for RL sites; and the support received from the CES central office staff at Brown University. Overall, it was indicated that "the support system is OK."

Barriers

Among the barriers encountered were: resistance of some staff to the ACT initiative; elements of jealousy or competition from some faculty (e.g., some said, "You get all the attention in the school and local media"); fear of job loss by some elective teachers who feel "all of the elective teachers are going to go out the window"; the lack of overt public support for RL by the principal; and "the normal fear of change that's always there."

Anticipated Activities

Summer activities related to the planned 1991-92 implementation of a tenth grade team, the continued implementation of the ninth grade team, and the continuation of the humanities course include: participation by six staff in the state-sponsored TREK; interdisciplinary curriculum development work by both teams, and refinement of the humanities course; and the conduct of one or two team-building retreats for all RL staff.

Additionally, it was noted that the superintendent had given the RL planning committee two Act 80 days to use at its discretion during the next school year. The committee plans to use these days to conduct a whole-faculty diagnosis of "what the school is like now," and develop a vision statement of "what they want it to be like," to provide direction to and ownership of subsequent change efforts. Finally, the TC and co-TC indicated they would like "to do some one-on-one work with somewhat interested faculty to bring more staff on board the RL initiative." Basically, they plan to be more proactive in inviting other faculty to their class to see RL modeled, and then offer to work with those faculty willing to try out some of their RL approaches, and to provide them feedback and support. They plan to proceed in a slow and collegial manner.

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT:
EAST HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 10 elementary, 3 junior high, 2 high schools, 1 alternative school

Student Enrollment: 10,120 (growing -- high schools are stable)

Student Population: 96 percent white, 4 percent non-white

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $6,078

Number of Teachers: 296 elementary, 151 junior high, 160 secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	7 Assistant/Vice Principals
1 Assistant Superintendent	7 Supervisors
15 Principals	25 Department Heads

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

East High School, grades 10-12, 1142 students, 79 teachers
West High School, grades 10-12, 1160 students, 81 teachers

East High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Re:Learning Steering Committee, 9 teachers, 2 administrators
Essential Questions of Western Civilization course, 3 teachers, 45 students
Cultural Perspectives course, 3 teachers, 43 students
Advanced Placement English and French unit, 2 teachers, 50 students
Practical Economics course, 2 teachers, 36 students

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

Central Bucks School District has been involved in cooperative learning, writing across the curriculum, technology usage, and middle-level school improvement efforts.

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

The most controversial and/or visible school issues over the past year or two have been: teacher contract issues, the budget, building bond issues, the change from an eight to a seven class period day, discussion of program cuts, Re:Learning communication issues, and misinterpretations of the meaning of the word "restructuring." The community is unwilling/reluctant to pay for services. The local newspaper is leading the charge against taxes.

Description of the Community:

The Central Bucks School District is located in a rural/suburban, middle/upper middle class area where pockets of poverty exist. A high percentage of community residents do not have children in the public schools.

Overview

Central Bucks School District's involvement in RL originated as the direct result of the work of a district-wide "futures committee" convened in January 1988. After approximately a year of committee exploration of RL, and another year of information dissemination, faculty discussion, and planning activities, the district adopted a "pilot project" approach to RL. Teams of teachers from both high schools in the district, East and West, were invited in the spring of 1990 to submit proposals for the development of team taught interdisciplinary courses to be piloted in 1990-91. Of fifteen proposed courses, four from East High School and five from West High School were selected for funding. The building principals, assistant principals, and teachers' association representatives from both schools played key roles in the proposal selection process to insure that there was equity across teams regarding proposed travel and funding.

The four courses piloted at East High School in 1990-91 included the following: Essential Questions of Western Civilization, Cultural Perspectives, Advanced Placement English and French, and Practical Economics. A total of nine teachers (about 10 percent of the faculty) and 200 students were involved in the above courses. One teacher participated in two courses. The courses focused primarily on the RL principles: student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach, personalization, exhibition of mastery, and less-is-more.

Plans for the 1991-92 school year are that the above courses will be refined and continued, and three additional courses will be offered: Physics and Calculus, Applied Physics and Industrial Arts, and an eleventh grade version of Cultural Perspectives.

Leadership, Management, and Support

Central Bucks East High School's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the RL initiative are described below. The TC's reflections on the progress made in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also addressed.

Committee Structure

There was a transition in the district's RL leadership structure in the past year. From 1988 through mid-1990, the "futures committee" directed the district's RL activities. During most of that time period, an administrator from the junior high was charged with coordinating the district's study/exploration of RL. With the beginning of the 1990-91 school year, building level RL steering committees, formed in April-May 1990, commenced their activities at each high school At East, the steering committee consisted of

the seven teachers involved in the pilot projects, two teachers' association building representatives, and the assistant superintendent.

The building steering committee generally met on a monthly basis for about an hour after school. It met more frequently, however, at the beginning of the school year when the specifics of RL funding were under consideration. The committee was responsible for: promoting and expanding the initiative to include more faculty; deciding who will attend various RL conferences and networking meetings; discussing, developing, and refining the school's implementation of RL; and bringing RL's needs to the attention of building and central office administrators. The members on the committee who were involved in pilot activities had a fair amount of latitude regarding the development of the curriculum/subject matter for the interdisciplinary courses.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

At the urging of the "PDE state RL coordinator," a building level TC was nominated and elected at East in December 1990. The TC, an English teacher, had served on the futures committee, and had visited Brown University two years ago to participate in a CES summer institute. She was also involved in one of the pilot courses. As coordinator, she chaired the meetings of the building RL steering committee. The TC saw herself as being relatively new to this role, and indicated that "the decision-making authority for the overall direction of the RL initiative tended to reside with the central office and building administrators, with the teachers working within the parameters they established." She felt that she was "a key person in disseminating information about RL in the school" and indicated that she used a "personalized approach" with staff to acquaint them with RL and elicit their interest. She also saw herself as a direct link to the principal and the assistant superintendent, and stated: "They (the RL participants) had not been denied anything, per se, for the project."

According to the TC, "communications were difficult last year because the former district coordinator was an administrator at a different school." This year, however, "communications with and between the teams of interdisciplinary RL course teachers were better." Overall, she felt she played a lead role in establishing more direct and immediate two-way communications with the district administration.

Administrative Support

Both the board and the central office staff have been supportive of RL in the district. The TC emphasized that "the board listened to us very seriously and gave us this opportunity." The Board authorized RL and has kept the topic of RL on their standing curriculum sub-committee agenda. Board members also participated in the futures committee, and attended the "Tri-county Conversations" about RL sponsored by the district.

The only area that was problematic regarding the board's support was that the board, due in part to community pressures, decided that "all" academic teachers would start teaching six classes in the 1991-92 school year, instead of the five classes they were used to teaching. The TC felt that this would make it more difficult to implement RL next year, in that less time would be available for planning and interaction among the teams of teachers.

The superintendent and assistant superintendent have shown their support in several ways. Both central office administrators have publicly stated that they are impressed with what's going on in RL and strongly advocate it. The superintendent also gave RL a vote of confidence by arranging to feature it on "Report Card," a local cable television show. In addition, he featured the RL initiative in early 1991 on his monthly district video-tape show which focuses on different educational themes. According to the TC, the superintendent told how he became involved in the program, and what it involved. He also interviewed a board member, teachers, and students regarding the various aspects of the pilot programs and progress to date.

The assistant superintendent participated as needed in the steering committee meetings and made himself available to respond to RL-related needs. He recently suggested that the RL project staff use the district staff development days next year to bring people in to provide the RL staff with the training they desired.

The building principal, who has been assigned to another building next year, was also an advocate for the program. The TC said: "He was very accepting and supportive of RL, participated in committee meetings as needed, attended RL-related workshops, publicly promoted RL, encouraged staff and parent participation, and kind of acted as a cheerleader for the whole project."

Financial Support

In the 1990-91 school year, East spent $25,000 on RL, $7,000 of which was provided by PDE. The TC indicated that the money was used to pay staff for curriculum development work, provide for substitutes to enable staff to attend RL meetings, and provide for travel/conference expenses. She added that the majority of the money was spent on substitutes and travel, with some of the travel dollars being used to take students on course-related trips.

Reflections

The following reflections were offered by the TC on leadership and support. She noted that there was room for greater teacher empowerment, shared leadership, and involvement in decisionmaking in the RL initiative. She said: "Both central office staff are supportive, but we still have some administrator and board restrictions (e.g., the forthcoming six period teaching day). We (the teachers) don't make the decisions. We have building grants but no decisionmaking or staff development to support it. We don't have site-based management here yet." She added: "We have opened up some avenues for discussion, though. Now, we're approaching the central office staff and advising them on what needs to be done next. I think we need to be more empowered than we are, but I think that's on its way."

She also mentioned that she felt that teachers' and administrators' participation in the PDE-sponsored "teacher and principal conversation meetings" was enlightening; district staff could see how teachers at other Pennsylvania RL sites were being empowered. She said: "I think we've come a long way. The district is now setting up a committee to work on site-based management, and RL will be a part of it."

The TC also indicated that the teachers' association tended to be somewhat skeptical of RL. She stated: "The teachers' organization seems to believe that teachers may get preferential treatment if they elect to get involved in an RL pilot." She added: "They think the ideas are wonderful but don't see sufficient district monetary support for the project, and are also concerned that RL may mean fewer jobs. Additionally, the union is concerned about the RL agreements made by the district with the state because of the tight financial situation (and its implication for teacher jobs)." She concluded: "They (the union) worry me, because they tend to be like some of the staff; they speak before they know, and they don't fully understand RL."

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

The building RL committee did not make a major effort to bring new staff into the program this year. Communications with non-RL staff concerning the program generally occurred through individual networking. The TC stated: "We're not proselitizing about RL; we're just doing it in a quiet way." The RL initiative, however, was promoted in the superintendent's monthly telecast, in an article in the school paper, through the posting of school board meeting notes, and on the occasion of the state RL coordinator's visit to the school.

Additionally, RL staff participated in two "Tri-county Conversation" meetings. These conversations, which involved staff from Central Bucks, New Hope-Solebury, and Centennial school districts, were initiated by Central Bucks to facilitate networking between RL schools. Several board members also attended the "conversations," and expanded their understanding of RL.

Overall, the TC felt that the first year of experience "doing RL" enhanced the commitment of the teachers involved in RL, and resulted in significant pockets of parent support.

Work on building staff capacity to implement RL is in progress. During the past year, RL staff attended a variety of PDE-sponsored RL meetings in Harrisburg, State College, and Carlisle. Several RL staff also attended Grant Wiggins' presentations on "exhibitions" at New Hope and Central Bucks, participated in a two-day presentation by Mary Sauls of ETS on portfolio assessment, and experienced a day of training on cooperative learning at the local intermediate unit. The RL staff and others also spent two days in the summer of 1990 with Amy Gerstein of CES. Her presentation focused on developing "essential questions and interdisciplinary curriculum." Reflecting on the school staff's capacity to implement RL, the TC felt that there was a need for TREK "leadership training" for RL staff, and for additional staff development on the particulars of RL.

Major Activities

Descriptions of the four interdisciplinary courses piloted at East in 1990-91 are provided below.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Essential Questions of Western Civilization

This elective course for 45 eleventh and/or twelfth graders met for a double period each day, and was team-taught by three teachers: an English, a history, and an industrial arts teacher. The English teacher and history teacher co-taught the first period, and were joined by the Industrial Arts teacher during the second period. The teachers worked together prior to the course to develop the essential questions and the curriculum. They also received assistance with cooperative learning techniques and learning styles. At the beginning of the course, students were sensitized to differences in learning styles and working in groups. Students worked in teams throughout the year and were responsible for researching and presenting their own information. At the end of each unit they were required to do an exhibition. The course stressed the principle "student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach." The teachers of this course had no common planning time, and did not cultivate a parent group, although they plan to next year.

Cultural Perspectives

This required course for 43 academically talented and motivated tenth graders met for a double period each day, and was team-taught by three teachers: an English, a history, and an art teacher. All three teachers were present for both periods, and also had a common planning period in addition to a common lunch. The course was set up to work with the same students for three years (grades 10, 11, and 12). According to the TC, who was the English teacher for this course, the course focused on: the personalization of teaching and learning, conferencing with students, student-as-worker, exhibitions, students' evaluating themselves and each other, and the integration of the curriculum around the essential question -- "What decisions have Americans made, and what are they based on?". The three teachers started writing the course during the summer and completed it during the early fall. They also invited parents in three times during the year to discuss the pilot course and respond to questions and concerns.

The students' experiences during the course included the following. Every student reported on some project every marking period over four marking periods. Students were required to explore the course or unit content in more depth. The intent was to help them learn to use their minds well. Research, summarizing, and writing skills were emphasized. They did exhibitions both as individuals and in teams. Some of the exhibitions were taped. They also worked with the art teacher in the computer lab, and had the experience of working with a poet for several days. Each student wrote two poems which were published in a book titled, Our Town: Doylestown, with the help of a $2,000 grant. Generally, students were encouraged to explore and present in their individual talent areas (e.g., video taping, art productions). All students shared what they produced. The course involved one unit per marking period.

On reflecting on the course, the TC noted the following:

> Starting by writing a brand new course was a mistake, and integrating the curriculum was the biggest problem -- but, now we can see that our curriculums were never complementary. It also was a struggle to get the students to

take the responsibility for their own learning. Additionally, the kids needed a lot of coaching to help them become more sophisticated in their exhibition presentations. An unexpected bonus, however, was that we had three teachers' views on each student.

Practical Economics

A business teacher and a history teacher teamed to prepare this one semester elective course for 36 students. The teachers had some paid curriculum preparation time in the summer, but had no common planning time during the year. According to the TC, they put in a lot of planning hours on their own, as did the teachers of the other courses described herein. Students in this course did projects, created a corporation, sold stocks, and engaged in other practical marketing exercises.

Advanced Placement English and French

A French teacher and an English teacher, who had no common planning time, collaborated on this four-week unit for 50 twelfth graders. The teachers combined their classes. Students read/studied the drama, Antigone, in English and then in French. They examined differences both in the interpretation and the adaptation of the drama in a modern sense. Exhibitions related to these differences were conducted by teams of students who worked in cooperative groups.

Effects of Re:Learning

Staff responses to RL, and the responses of students and parents to the pilot courses are presented below.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

The general responses of the teachers involved in the RL pilot courses were quite positive. According to the TC, teachers reported that they learned from each other, found the close professional interaction with each other rewarding, grew more than anticipated, and experienced a resurgence of interest and enthusiasm in teaching. She said: "You can see the camaraderie and collegiality among the teachers. They are not threatened by each other, and they respect each other. They are willing to share. They can relax and take a risk."

The TC also felt that "the pilot teachers' attitudes toward parents changed for the positive due to the parents' support and favorable reactions to the tenth grade pilot course." She noted that the pilot course teams that did not make sustained outreach efforts to parents this past year plan to do so next year.

The TC also indicated that some of the teachers who did not view RL favorably, "were worse than ever." She added: "It's the few negative people who are the most vocal; the biggest critics just won't investigate the project (to find out what it's really about) -- they just don't want to be involved."

Responses to the Pilot Courses

The TC indicated that the students' responses to the pilot courses were generally very favorable. She felt that the students were "more enthusiastic about learning and their experiences in the courses." She reported that "some students were now saying that the traditional classes were restraining in that they offered less opportunity for individuality, and for expression of one's thoughts regarding essential questions." She also noted that a number of the students in the tenth grade course (Cultural Perspectives), which she team-taught, became so caught up in the course that "they asked the team to give them the course books for next year, so that they could get a start on them over the summer." She confided that a few of the tenth graders had difficulty taking more responsibility for their learning; they needed more structure. As a consequence, the team will likely lose about ten students next year and replace them with ten new students.

The TC indicated that the tenth grade team, which had the most contact with parents, was very gratified by their reaction. She related the following.

> The parents were adamantly against the program in the beginning. They didn't understand why the students weren't getting more readings and information (i.e., "less-is-more") in the course. However, as we met with them over the year their skepticism changed to support. They came to realize their responsibility to be involved in education. Now they are calling us on the phone, visiting classes, and accompanying us on trips. They voluntarily organized a parent network which is growing; 15-20 parents are currently involved. They also brought in guidance counselors and a "tough-love" group. Overall, we met with them four times since January 1991.
>
> Now, in comparison to the beginning of the year, you would have thought that we paid them to say what they are saying (e.g., "The kids are turned around." "Now my boy wants to go to college."). Now, they want to know. Overall, we found that the parents were more accepting and supportive once they got to know the program. It takes more than the classroom teacher to make this work.

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as enablers were: the change in the district's perceptions of RL, and the willingness of the board and the central office to continue the RL activities; and the continued participation of central office staff and board members in district and/or state-sponsored RL meetings and activities.

Barriers

Among the reported barriers encountered were: the difficulties encountered in getting the entire faculty to accept RL, and the continuing adversarial conditions among RL and some non-RL faculty; the related perception by some staff that the RL teachers are "out for glory;" the non-participants' view that RL is just another trend that will go away after the state monies are removed; the perception by many faculty that there is a competition between dollars for RL, and dollars to maintain staff positions (i.e., it is projected that four or five staff positions will be lost at East at the end of the year); the proposed shift, next year, to a six-period teaching day for all faculty; and the parents' concern that the "students will get what they need to know (i.e., content knowledge) for college." The TC was of the opinion that more work needs to be done to correlate the evolving RL curriculum (less-is-more) with both college prerequisites and the state's "Chapter 5" curriculum regulations.

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation of three RL teachers in a one-week CES summer institute at Brown University, on curriculum development and exhibitions; participation of several RL staff in PDE's TREK; five to ten days of curriculum writing by each of the 1990-91 teams and three new teams; and staff development planning for the coming school year.

Anticipated implementation activities in the 1991-92 school year include the continuation of the four courses piloted in 1990-91. Three new courses will also be offered: an Industrial Arts and Physics interdisciplinary course for eleventh and twelfth graders, a Physics and Calculus interdisciplinary course for eleventh and twelfth graders, and an eleventh grade Cultural Perspectives course.

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT:
WEST HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 10 elementary, 3 junior high, 2 high schools, 1 alternative school

Student Enrollment: 10,120 (growing -- high schools are stable)

Student Population: 96 percent white, 4 percent non-white

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $6,078

Number of Teachers: 296 elementary, 151 junior high, 160 secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	7 Assistant/Vice Principals
1 Assistant Superintendent	7 Supervisors
15 Principals	25 Department Heads

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

East High School, grades 10-12, 1142 students, 79 teachers
West High School, grades 10-12, 1160 students, 81 teachers

West High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Re:Learning Steering Committee, 15 teachers, 2 administrators
French 5 course, 4 teachers, 120 students
Composition and Computer course, 2 teachers, 90 students
Music Integration course, 2 teachers, 160 students
Rise of Western Civilization course, 2 teachers, 40 students
Bio-Science course, 3 teachers, 45 students

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

Central Bucks School District has been involved in cooperative learning, writing across the curriculum, technology usage, and middle-level school improvement efforts.

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

The most controversial and/or visible school issues over the past year or two have been: teacher contract issues, the budget, building bond issues, the change from an eight to a seven class period day, discussion of program cuts, Re:Learning communication issues, and misinterpretations of the meaning of the word "restructuring." The community is unwilling/reluctant to pay for services. The local newspaper is leading the charge against taxes.

Description of the Community:

The Central Bucks School District is located in a rural/suburban, middle/upper middle class area where pockets of poverty exist. A high percentage of community residents do not have children in the public schools.

Overview

Central Bucks School District's involvement in RL originated as the direct result of the work of a district-wide "futures committee" convened in January 1988. After approximately a year of committee exploration of RL, and another year of information dissemination, faculty discussion, and planning activities, the district adopted a "pilot project" approach to RL. Teams of teachers from both high schools in the district, East and West, were invited in the spring of 1990 to submit proposals for the development of team taught interdisciplinary courses to be piloted in 1990-91. Of fifteen proposed courses, four from East High School and five from West High School were selected for funding. The building principals, assistant principals, and teachers' association representatives from both schools played key roles in the proposal selection process to insure that there was equity across teams regarding proposed travel and funding.

At West High School the five courses piloted were: French 5, Composition and Computer, Music Integration, Rise of Western Civilization, and Bio-Science. Overall, twelve teachers (about 15 percent of the faculty) and 455 students were involved in the courses. The courses focused primarily on the RL principles: student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach, personalization, exhibition of mastery, and less-is-more.

Plans for the 1991-92 school year are that the above courses will be refined and continued. West is also considering the implementation of an additional course for tenth graders, and a student advisory program.

Leadership, Management, and Support

Central Bucks West High School's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. The TC's reflections on the progress made in expanding the shared leadership of the RL are also addressed.

Committee Structure

West High School's 13-15 member building RL committee was formed in the late spring of 1990. It consists primarily of the teachers involved in the pilot courses and has a very informal sub-committee structure. Committee meetings are held at least once a month for one to two hours after school. They are open to all staff and anyone can be on the committee if they desire. The principal and assistant principal have a standing invitation to attend, and attended as time permitted. The superintendent and assistant superintendent also were involved on occasion. According to the TC, a core group of about 8-10 attended most meetings.

The committee basically makes decisions about the distribution of state and local monies for the pilot projects/courses, and the general direction of RL in the school. The committee also serves as a support and networking group for the pilot project teachers. Decisions are generally made through group consensus after a period of facilitated discussion. According to the TC, the committee's decisions "mostly involve the pilot projects," and the committee's work exhibits "a spirit of cooperation and mutual caring by the teachers who are committed to RL." Individual RL teaching teams, however, make the decisions about specific expenditures for their pilot courses.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

The teacher coordinator, who is the school librarian, was invited to participate in the "futures committee" meetings, and disseminated information about that committee's activities to school staff. Due to that role, she felt she was seen as a leader by the central office staff and was subsequently appointed to the TC's role when the building RL committee was formed. According to the TC, she schedules and facilitates RL meetings, acts as a liaison between the school staff and administration, serves as the RL "contact person" for the school, and disseminates information to both the committee and other school staff.

Administrative Support

Both the board and the central office staff have been supportive of RL in the district. The TC reported she knows several board members professionally, and "they occasionally stop by the school to inquire about the project."

The building principal's level of interest, enthusiasm, and support for RL is very high, and there is a productive relationship between the TC and the principal. According to the TC, the principal "wants RL to work and does all that he can to facilitate things." The TC said: "The principal worked hard to schedule the pilot staff so that they could work together, and, as a result, they have had some common planning time together insofar as was possible within the constraints of the current bell schedule."

Financial Support

In 1990-91, West received $14,000 from the state and $14,000 from the district for RL. Approximately forty percent was spent on substitutes, course materials, and/or travel. The remaining sixty percent of the money was spent to buy the time of several teachers for one period a day, either to work with or free up the pilot teachers for a period a day. According to the TC, "RL teachers can't teacher six periods a day and really do RL. So, if we wanted a person to teach five periods a day, the district said, 'You have to buy a teacher to cover the sixth period.'" She indicated the committee could only buy about five people with the dollars allocated. She added: "This constraint could doom the project if the dollars dry up and the RL teachers have to go back to teaching six periods." She felt that this would be a shame because, "Now we have given teachers a notion of what they can accomplish if they only have to teach five periods, and have the time to work collaboratively with other teachers." Overall, she held out little hope for RL if the projected six-period teaching day were enforced, and/or if alternative strategies were not developed.

Reflections

The TC generally felt that there was shared leadership among the pilot project staff in 1990-91. However, she noted that little progress had been make in expanding the initiative and its shared leadership. Additionally, she took exception with "Ted Sizer's utopian notion of an 80:1 student-teacher ratio." She said: "He's built defeat into his own ideas. The project has become politicized because of the 80:1 standard. It's just not feasible economically, and it has become an issue with the teachers' association." She indicated that some of the members of the association had indicated strongly that "RL is just a fad that will pass."

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

Several activities were engaged in to promote RL in 1990-91. Specifically:

- three one-hour, after-school, discussions of RL were conducted by the TC
- copies of "Horace" and other RL materials were distributed to all interested staff
- one newsletter was published
- two RL briefings were conducted at faculty meetings
- individual faculty members had informal contacts with parents regarding the pilot projects.

Overall, however, the TC felt that there were some concerns about expanding RL that needed to be noted. She elaborated:

> All of our pilot teachers are trying to find their own way, and most of the RL work is "add-on" work. Partly, we haven't done a good job of promoting it because our RL staff are also involved in a lot of other things. In addition, there was quite a bit of faculty negativity last year. Accordingly, we (the RL project) have been a little protective of ourself this year and have maintained somewhat of a low profile in the building. Where we are now is trying to define "it." We are also concerned with how to spread RL.

Additionally, the district is considering multiple approaches to educational reform; among them, increased accountability in the form of common exams at East and West, and a requirement to follow curriculum guides. "Meeting these expectations poses a conflict" in the eyes of the TC. She said: "We are getting mixed messages from the district. Although the administration says RL teachers do not have to comply with the proposed accountability reforms, some RL teachers are uncertain and somewhat mistrustful."

"The RL staff would also benefit (i.e., increase their capacity to implement RL) if they were provided more RL content and leadership process training," according to the TC. "The opportunity has been there, but it just hasn't happened yet," she said. A few RL staff participated in a few state-sponsored "teacher conversation" meetings, but, to date, they have not traveled to other RL/CES sites, Brown University, or any of the CES national forums. Attendance at the proposed state-sponsored RL curriculum institute and the TREK this summer, however, is planned.

Major Activities

Descriptions of the five interdisciplinary courses piloted at West in 1990-91 are provided below. Each was designed by a small team of teachers. The RL principles focused on, in the courses, were: student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach, personalization, less-is-more, and exhibition of mastery. All course teachers also engaged the students in cooperative learning activities.

French 5

Four teachers (French, history, art, and music) were involved in the presentation of this elective course for 120 twelfth graders. The course integrated the teaching of French as a language with the cultural/historical aspects of France. It addressed the question: "What is France in relation to French?" The teachers gave up (with some trepidation) some of their teaching responsibility during the course and engaged the students in library research and teaching each other. Students also put on exhibitions of their projects in the form of presentations or media productions. Board members and parents were invited to these exhibitions.

Composition and Computer

A business course teacher and an English teacher combined to offer this course to two sections of tenth graders (90 students) each semester in 1990-91. The course integrated the teaching of composition and the teaching of the computer (keyboarding/word processing). Each student composition went through one or two revisions with the English teacher and was produced on the computer in final "published form." Portfolios of student work were maintained.

Music Integration

This pilot project was not a course; rather, it was an approach to teaching which enabled the band and choral instructors to team up and "play-off-each-other" in ways that they had been unable to before. It also freed the choral teacher to work with the French 5 students. Overall, 160 tenth through twelfth graders were exposed to this integrated band and choral instruction.

Rise of Western Civilization

This course for 40 eleventh and twelfth graders covered classical times through the renaissance, and included relevant art and music instruction. It

was team-taught daily by an English and a history teacher who were joined on selected occasions by the art and music teachers.

Bio-Science

Two biology teachers and a physical education teacher collaborated to teach this two-period elective course to 45 eleventh and twelfth graders. The biology teachers provided instruction on "body systems" and the students applied the instruction (e.g., heart rate, effects of exercise) under the tutelage of the physical education instructor. Among other activities, the students set personal physical development goals as a part of the course, and worked on and evaluated their progress in developing large muscle groups at the YMCA. The students also produced a newsletter describing their course activities. Additionally, students were required to provide both physical and oral explanations of what they had mastered in the course.

Effects of Re:Learning

The effects that RL has had to date on staff, students, and parents are described below.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

The TC felt that the RL experience has been a very positive one for the participants. She said:

> For some of our teachers, this has been a real shot in the arm. Doing RL has reduced teachers' uncertainty about RL. There has also been more contact with students in the pilots, and I've seen stronger attachments between staff and the students. Generally, I hear warmer things being said. All of our pilot teachers want to continue next year. They believe that what they are doing, matters. Unfortunately, however, some non-participants tend to remain skeptical.

Responses to the Pilot Courses

Student and parent responses to the pilot courses have generally been favorable according to the TC. A breakdown of responses to specific courses was not provided. However, the TC stated that a large group meeting of RL staff and students was held in the late fall to assess the progress of the courses. She indicated that the students at that meeting had very positive things to say about the courses. Parent responses to the exhibitions have also been positive.

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are described below.

Enablers

Cited as important enablers were: the commitment of the pilot project teachers to "do the best job possible," the receptivity of the students to RL, and the support of the administration and board.

Barriers

Among the barriers encountered were: the general difficulties of implementing an open-ended initiative (i.e., "There is no cookbook for RL."), potentially mixed messages from the administration, and tensions among participants and non-participants.

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation by several staff in the state-sponsored TREK and Shippensburg Curriculum Institute, and curriculum writing by several staff. Additionally, the current pilot courses will be repeated in 1991-92. A student advisory program and another course at the tenth grade are also under consideration.

EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY (ELANCO) SCHOOL DISTRICT: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 5 elementary, 1 junior-senior high school

Student Enrollment: 3,100 students (growing)

Student Population: 97 percent white, 1 percent black, 1 percent Hispanic, 1 percent other

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $5,200

Number of Teachers: 103 elementary, 120 junior-senior high

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	4 Supervisors or Coordinators
1 Assistant Superintendent	9 Curricular Chairs--Senior High
5 Principals	5 Curricular Chairs--Junior High
3 Assistant/Vice Principals	5 Curricular Chairs--Elementary

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

Garden Spot Junior/Senior High, grades 7-12, 1372 students, 120 teachers
New Holland Elementary, grades K-3, 400 students, 16 teachers

Junior High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Re:Learning committee, 5 teachers, 1 administrator
Two seventh grade teams, 8 teachers, 250 students
Two eighth grade teams, 8 teachers, 236 students

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

Over the past few years the district has attempted to help teachers apply the findings of cognitive research in the design and conduct of their lessons, and re-think the structure of the curriculum.

Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

Several major issues have arisen from the dialogue about Re:Learning. With regard to "less is more," what types of knowledge and skills do students need and in what areas? How will these areas of knowledge and skills be assessed using performance measures? Given the widespread use and acceptance of traditional high school courses and assessment practices, how will new curricula and assessment practices be accepted by college admissions staff and parents?

Description of the Community:

ELANCO is a rural district seven miles east of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The district is 97 square miles in area and has an operating budget of $17 million. Two major agri-related corporations, Ford New Holland and Tyson Chicken, and a variety of small businesses operate within the district. A large portion of the population are Mennonites who send their children to their own church-related schools.

Overview

Eastern Lancaster County (ELANCO) School District's exploration of RL began in late 1988. It was guided by the assistant superintendent who had a strong interest in innovative educational practices. The district's exploratory and planning activities, under the aegis of a district-wide steering committee (cadre) chaired by the assistant superintendent, proceeded through the 1989-90 school year, during which time separate building RL steering committees were formed at both the junior and senior high schools.

The assistant superintendent was the primary visionary and organizer behind the district's RL initiative, and his departure at the end of the 1989-90 school year resulted in a temporary disruption of communications between the junior high and senior high RL staff during the latter half of 1990. District staff energies at the central office and the high school also were absorbed with the Middle States School Accreditation process in 1989, 1990, and 1991, and this major activity detracted some energy and attention from RL.

Additionally, the RL activities of the junior and senior high have varied, due to differences in both the organizational structure and leadership of the schools.

The junior high is structured more like a middle school, and over half of the teachers have been organized into four-person teaching teams since the beginning of the 1988-89 school year. The principal also was quite active on the original district RL steering committee, and has continued to support and work closely with the building RL teacher coordinator. In the past year, the teams implemented various aspects of RL (e.g., student-as-worker and personalization) on a somewhat piecemeal exploratory basis. Next year, they plan to be more systematic in their approach by focusing on the creation of additional interdisciplinary units.

Accomplishments during the year included the activities cited above, the eventual bridging of communications between the junior and senior high in December 1990, and the preparation of plans to proceed more systematically with RL during the 1991-92 school year.

Leadership, Management, and Support

ELANCO Junior High School's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. Reflections on the progress to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also cited.

Committee Structure

The junior high school's RL activities are guided by a six-person volunteer committee consisting of the principal, two seventh grade teachers (one of whom is the teacher coordinator), two eighth grade teachers, and a teacher with responsibilities at both grade levels. Four sub-committees (assessment, service projects, public relations, and curriculum development) grew out of the work of the RL committee. Each is chaired by a member of the RL committee, and is composed of volunteer teachers.

The RL committee generally met for a full day, every three to six weeks over the course of the school year. Some hour-long meetings after school were also scheduled, as needed. The committee set the direction and goals for RL in the building, decided on funding matters, kept track of expenditures, decided who would go to conferences and meetings, handled public relations and internal communications, and attended to team needs and interdisciplinary instruction matters. Decisions were made by group consensus. The committee cooperated closely with the principal, who steps out of her formal role when she is "a member" of the committee.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

The teacher coordinator was a member of the original district RL steering committee (cadre) and was asked by the principal to be the building teacher coordinator. Her major role is to chair and lead the RL committee's activities. In that regard, she noted that she schedules meetings, arranges for substitutes, keeps track of the paperwork related to staff hours and expenses, acts as the primary building liaison with the state RL coordinator, reviews all incoming RL-related information and requests, decides on the matters that need to be brought to the committee's formal attention, coordinates networking, and handles internal communications.

The TC indicated that the primary change in her role in 1990-91 was that she was given more responsibility for accounting for the funds allocated to the building for RL. Accordingly, she reported she now has more "paperwork."

Administrative Support

The TC stated that both the superintendent (one and one-half years in the district) and the assistant superintendent (new to the job in 1990-91) supported RL. She noted, however, that they were both less actively involved in administering the project than the former assistant superintendent (the originator of the district's involvement in the project). She felt that they had less understanding of the project. She also reported that they had been heavily involved in the high school's "Middle States" activity this past year. She said, "They have more or less stepped out of it; there has been less central office involvement this year."

The Board of Education was also seen as being very supportive of RL. The TC, though, would have liked to have seen even more board involvement. She felt that they were probably less informed of RL this year, and she was looking forward to the opportunity for the committee to brief them at a board meeting scheduled in August, 1991. She reported that the committee last briefed the board about a year ago.

The principal was viewed by the TC as being very supportive. She said, "The principal has always been very active in RL (she was a member of the original cadre). I talk to her a lot about the project, and get her advice on things when needed. We have a very good principal supporting us."

Financial Support

In the 1990-91 school year, the junior high RL committee spent about $13,500 on RL; $3,500 of which came from the state and the remainder from the building's staff development budget. The TC reported that about 80 percent of the monies were spent to free up staff to work on RL (e.g., summer and after-school work, substitute coverage, coordinator relief), 15 percent to cover travel expenses, and 5 percent on consultant expenses and materials.

Reflections

The TC offered the following reflections on RL-related leadership and support. She felt that both the board and the central office staff could be more actively or regularly involved in some way in RL. She also hoped that a meeting of the district-wide RL committee (cadre) would be held. It had not met in the 1990-91 school year, and therefore had not been able to serve, in part, to promote district-wide communications and cooperation. She noted that communications with the senior high RL project had broken down after the former assistant superintendent departed. It took a meeting of the new assistant superintendent, the junior high principal, and the teacher coordinators from both schools to restore effective internal communication procedures in December 1990.

Some measure of success was seen in expanding the shared leadership of the project. The TC reported that the teachers had voted to establish a "parent involvement night," and that a variety of teachers had volunteered to participate in the various RL sub-committees. She said, "I think we are including more people by forming sub-committees chaired by RL committee members. That gives other staff the chance to be involved (on the committees) and participate in making the decisions."

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

A variety of approaches were used by the RL committee to build understanding and foster commitment to the project. Key activities in 1990-91 included:

- sharing the RL committee's "goals" and "mission statement" with the faculty on the first day of school
- RL presentations or briefings to the staff by the TC at seven of the ten faculty meetings, and presentations on two of the inservice days
- two articles related to RL written by the principal for the school newspaper
- invitations to the staff to become involved in the RL sub-committees

- informal periodic briefings for the central office staff
- inviting interested non-RL staff to participate in RL-related trips, off-site meetings, and workshops.

Additionally, on parents night, the committee described for parents "how things were changing, and how and why their students' education would be different" (e.g., less drill in math, cooperative learning, asking students to do more on their own, teachers as coaches and not lecturers).

A number of activities contributed to the committee's capacity to implement RL in 1990-91. Specifically:

- the principal and two teachers attended a three-day conference on alternative assessment by Grant Wiggins
- two staff participated in a state-sponsored teacher-principal "conversation"
- five team members visited the CES school Central Park East, in New York
- several teachers visited AMY-6 in Philadelphia for a day
- two teachers attended a PDE-sponsored workshop by Richard Stiggins on alternative assessment
- eight teachers attended a five-day training session on Johnson and Johnson's model of cooperative learning.

The three staff who attended the St. Louis training session conducted a follow-up workshop of their own on alternative assessment for nine staff members, thus spreading the impact of their newly acquired knowledge. The TC noted that it is building policy to send a variety of staff out to participate in staff development activities. It is also policy to have them share their learnings with the rest of the faculty. The TC said that the 10 early dismissal days (two hours per day) are used systematically for staff sharing of recent staff development experiences.

Major Activities

Descriptions of the seventh and eighth grade team structure and activities are provided below.

Team Structure

The team approach to teaching was initiated at ELANCO Junior High three years ago, prior to the school's involvement in RL. Basically, four "grade-level" teams are involved; two at the seventh and two at the eighth grade level. The original plan stipulated that the teams be reconstituted at the end of every three year period to provide, in part, for faculty rotation into

the teams. Each team is composed of four teachers: English, math, science, and social studies. One teacher on each team also serves as the team leader. Team leaders have curriculum responsibilities (sort of a department head design) and receive an additional $2,000 a year for the extra work required. Each seventh grade team works with approximately 125 students, while the eighth grade teams each work with about 118 students.

The school is on an eight-period, six-day cycle. All team members teach five periods and have a preparation period each day. The two remaining periods are "extra duty," and "club or other" activities periods; however, team members do not have an extra duty period every day. Instead, they have two periods for team meetings during each six-day cycle.

The teams also have the opportunity, one day a week, to schedule the students the way they want. Although they do not have double periods yet, they can arrange the schedule to team with other "humanities" teachers in a given period. According to the TC, the humanities teachers (home economics, health, physical education, special education, technology education, industrial arts, music, etc.) are invited to team meetings at least once a week. The TC noted, however, that "the ideal 80:1 student-teacher ratio won't happen here (because of economics)." She also indicated that the formation of a fifth or sixth "grade-level team" was not possible because of the number of students and staff, the constraints posed by the available facilities, and the school schedule. Thus, of the thirty teachers in the building, sixteen are most directly involved in the RL initiative, and another seven or eight are more tangentially involved.

Team Activities

The TC indicated that the four grade-level RL teams had experimented with the RL principles: student-as-worker, personalization, intellectual focus, and exhibitions (alternative assessment); however, the experimentation was not systematic, per se, across teams. Each team was tinkering, to one degree or another, with the above principles. She reported the following:

- a group of teachers (including non-RL staff) met regularly after school to study alternative assessment, and forms of alternative assessment were tried out on all four teams
- at least one member of each team had increased their use of higher level questions, in order to foster critical thinking
- cooperative learning was used somewhat regularly by all teams to promote student involvement (35 percent of the school staff have been trained in cooperative learning; 60 percent try it from time to time, and about 40 percent of the staff use it about 50 percent of the time)
- team experiments with interdisciplinary lessons/units were conducted although this activity occupied only about five percent of the teams' class time (e.g., units on the industrial revolution, colonial days, and the renaissance)
- a "recognition of student success" program was implemented to acknowledge students' academic achievement and effort. Students received

"Way to Go" cards, certificates for free bowling games, and/or recognition over the school's public announcement system. On some teams, letters to parents were also sent home commending individual student's work or behavior.

The TC reported that "the teams planned next year to focus more on assessment and less on trying out diverse activities." A school-wide "student service project" is also planned, and there are plans for one of the eighth grade teams to develop essential course goals and an interdisciplinary curriculum unit. The TC felt that this eighth grade team's work "would have the effect of raising us to a higher level of RL implementation."

Effects of Re:Learning

The effects that RL has had to date on staff and students are described below. The effects of RL on parents cannot be addressed, because school contacts with them have not been that extensive.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

The general response of the teachers involved in the RL teams has been positive. According to the TC, "teaming has allowed us to share ideas, assess and monitor student behavior with others, promote consistency in our discipline practices, coordinate our testing, plan projects, and interconnect with each other in some of our content areas." She said, "We know the students better, and we talk to each other. There has also been more of a focus on learning and less on paper and pencil drill." She added, "More importantly, the teachers are at a point where it's OK for them to be learning also. Additionally, if teachers were reading about or discussing professional issues before, it was kind of looked down upon; now it's more accepted." She noted that "a trust" had developed among team members.

She also noted that, as a direct result of the project and teaming, the school climate was improving, and teachers were becoming more accepting of students with different kinds of backgrounds. She said, "More in-depth work is being done with some kids with personal problems."

The TC also felt that the school staff in general had volunteered to do more things on the RL committees. She said, "If they didn't like it, they wouldn't volunteer." Overall, the TC was pleased with the school staff's response in 1990-91, and chose not to elaborate on or denigrate those who chose not to be involved in the project. She indicated that their behavior and reactions to the project varied, depending on the specific topic or issue at hand (e.g., some teachers objected to the parent conference night).

Student Responses to Teaming

According to the TC, "Teaming has helped, because the students know that we talk to each other." Overall, informal queries of the students have revealed that "they seem to like it, feel like they belong more, and seem to like how it is different (from more traditional approaches)."

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as enablers were: the support of a very strong principal who is actively involved in RL, and the fact that over two-thirds of the staff voted to approve having a "parent conference night." The TC felt the latter occurrence was quite positive in that "it showed the whole faculty that it was not just the RL committee that endorsed it (the parent night)."

Barriers

Among the reported barriers encountered were: the communications problem earlier in the school year with the high school, which finally got resolved; the decrease in K-12 communications regarding RL since the former assistant superintendent left; and the fact that the school's staff development monies may be cut by several thousands in the future.

Anticipated Activities

The proposed 1991-92 activities include: the reorganization of the four, four-person, grade-level teams; summer interdisciplinary curriculum work, guided by the principal and involving one of the eighth grade teams; development of essential course goals (less-is-more) by the same eighth grade team; systematic implementation of one or more interdisciplinary units by the eighth grade team; the addition of a technology teacher to work with the above eighth grade team; implementation of a school-wide parent conference night; more systematic communications with parents regarding the project; development and implementation of a "student community service project"; inclusion of a greater number of faculty (both RL participants and non-participants) in off-site staff development; the possible development of a workbook for staff on performance/alternative assessment; and more systematic work on interdisciplinary units by all teams.

EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY (ELANCO) SCHOOL DISTRICT: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 5 elementary, 1 junior-senior high school

Student Enrollment: 3,100 students (growing)

Student Population: 97 percent white, 1 percent black, 1 percent Hispanic, 1 percent other

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $5,200

Number of Teachers: 103 elementary, 120 junior-senior high

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	4 Supervisors or Coordinators
1 Assistant Superintendent	9 Curricular Chairs--Senior High
5 Principals	5 Curricular Chairs--Junior High
3 Assistant/Vice Principals	5 Curricular Chairs--Elementary

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

Garden Spot Junior/Senior High, grades 7-12, 1372 students, 120 teachers
New Holland Elementary, grades K-3, 400 students, 16 teachers

Senior High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Re:Learning committee, 14 teachers
Ninth grade team, 4 teachers, 96 students (proposed for 1991-92)
Experimentation with interdisciplinary courses, 18 groups of teachers

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

Over the past few years the district has attempted to increase teachers' instructional strategies, integrate cognitive development research with the teaching process, and re-think the structure of the curriculum.

Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

Several major issues have arisen from the dialogue about Re:Learning. With regard to "less is more," what types of knowledge and skills do students need and in what areas? How will these areas of knowledge and skills be assessed using performance measures? Given the widespread use and acceptance of traditional high school courses and assessment practices, how will new curricula and assessment practices be accepted by college admissions staff and parents?

Description of the Community:

ELANCO is a rural district seven miles east of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The district is 97 square miles in area and has an operating budget of $17 million. Two major agri-related corporations, Ford New Holland and Tyson Chicken, and a variety of small businesses operate within the district. A large portion of the population are Mennonites who send their children to their own church-related schools.

Overview

Eastern Lancaster County (ELANCO) School District's exploration of RL began in late 1988. It was guided by the assistant superintendent who had a strong interest in innovative educational practices. The district's exploratory and planning activities, under the aegis of a district-wide steering committee (cadre) chaired by the assistant superintendent, proceeded through the 1989-90 school year, during which time separate building RL steering committees were formed at both the junior and senior high schools.

The assistant superintendent was the primary visionary and organizer behind the district's RL initiative, and his departure at the end of the 1989-90 school year resulted in a temporary disruption of communications between the junior high and senior high RL staff during the latter half of 1990. District staff energies at the central office and the high school also were absorbed with the Middle States School Accreditation process in 1989, 1990, and 1991, and this major activity detracted some energy and attention from RL.

Additionally, the RL activities of the junior and senior high have varied, due to differences in both the organizational structure and leadership of the schools.

At the senior high there has been little building-level administrative involvement in RL, due in large part to the former assistant superintendent's dictum that the high school building committee was to be comprised solely of teachers. The more complex course schedule at the senior high also made it difficult for the RL building committee to find a common meeting time in the first half of the 1990-91 school year. Nevertheless, the RL committee, led by a teacher coordinator, managed during the past year to recruit a ninth grade RL team and to lay the groundwork for its implementation in the 1991-92 school year. The committee also promoted a school-wide experiment with interdisciplinary teaching; 18 groups of volunteer teachers (2-3 teachers per group) planned and presented interdisciplinary lessons which ranged from a single period to three weeks in duration.

In addition, communications were restored in December 1990 between the junior and senior high RL committees, and plans were made to proceed more systematically with RL during the 1991-92 school year.

Leadership, Management, and Support

ELANCO High School's committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described

below. Reflections on the progress to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also presented.

Committee Structure

The teacher coordinator for the high school was appointed by the former assistant superintendent in the 1989-90 school year. The coordinator initially established a building steering committee composed of 12 volunteer teachers, including two of the high school's seven department chairs, and a teachers' association building representative. Two of the proposed ninth grade team members were on the original committee, and two others were added in February 1991, bringing the committee total to 14 members.

The committee, which is responsible for making programmatic decisions about the shape that RL will take in the building, met approximately once a week for about an hour after school. Although committee members were allocated a free period during the week for meetings, they could not arrange a common period in which all were free to meet. Thus, they met in two separate groups for the first half of the 1990-91 school year. When this proved to be less productive than desired, they decided to meet after school as a whole group for the remainder of the year. Committee decisions were made using a process of facilitated discussion culminating in a "show of hands" or verbal consensus. Two sub-committees, each comprised of seven members, were also established; internal staff development/dissemination, and external communications (community, parents, and board).

Teacher Coordinator's Role

The TC scheduled and facilitated the RL committee meetings, served as a liaison with the district administration, and interacted with the high school advisory council a group of seven department chairs who rule on curriculum matters. The TC noted that there was a need this year to clarify with the advisory council the committee's role regarding curriculum decisions. The RL committee had assumed that it had been empowered to act unilaterally on curriculum matters without involving the advisory council. A territorial problem arose when the advisory council took exception to some of the committee's proposed curriculum revisions and to the terminology the committee was using. Discussions were held to resolve the matter. The RL committee agreed to collaborate with the advisory council, and appointed an individual who serves on both committees to present the RL committee's work to the advisory council for its input and reaction.

Administrative Support

The TC reported that both the superintendent and assistant superintendent have demonstrated their support for RL. The superintendent participated in a day-long committee meeting and offered his support for the project. The TC said he was frank about the support the district could provide, and discussed his reservations (monetary) about achieving CES' proposed 80:1 student/teacher ratio. The new assistant superintendent, a former assistant principal in the district, took an active interest in the project from the beginning and continued to participate as needed in many of the RL committee's meetings. The board of education, which approved the district's original participation in

RL, received periodic briefings from the assistant superintendent through the year, and an annual briefing from the RL committee.

The high school principal, although not an active committee member, participated in meetings when invited. According to the TC, "The principal attended one of PDE's 'principal conversation' meetings and got a better handle on the project." He added:

> He's never denied us any request, and he's willing to make some plant changes (e.g., modifying two large rooms) to accommodate the ninth grade team next year. He needs to be a part of the committee, and we're ready to ask him to be a member next year. It needs to be done.

Financial Support

Of the $14,000 received from the state for RL, $7,000 went to the high school, $3,500 to the junior high, and the remainder was held in reserve. The division of monies was determined by the assistant superintendent, who based his allocations on the number of staff involved in each school. The RL committee determined how its $7,000 would be used. About 80 percent was used to pay substitutes to free up the RL committee for four days to work on the ninth grade team plan for 1991-92. The remaining 20 percent was used to pay for workshop attendance, conferences, and travel.

Reflections

The TC was generally pleased with the progress that had been made with RL in 1990-91. He noted that the committee: added two members, established systematic communications with the high school advisory council, and was ready to include the principal in its membership. He also felt that the school staff "acquired a better understanding of what RL was all about, and that there was less confusion among the faculty about RL (e.g., student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach, interdisciplinary teaching)." He also stated: "The committee is more confident; we now know what we're doing."

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

The primary outreach activity to non-participating staff involved an invitation by the committee for the school staff to volunteer to collaborate with one another in designing and teaching an interdisciplinary lesson or unit. Faculty response, and the meetings and discussions with staff that ensued, increased staff understanding of RL according to the TC. The committee also conducted seven or eight briefings for faculty on the progress of RL at faculty meetings, early dismissal meetings, and inservice days.

According to the TC, a shortfall of the project has been "the non-existent communications with parents and the community." Plans are underway to establish, late in the summer of 1991, communications with the parents of students to be assigned to the proposed ninth grade team.

Activities which contributed in 1990-91 to the committee's capacity to implement RL included the following: four teachers visited a CES school (in

Louisville, Kentucky), two teachers attended a three-day "alternative assessment" conference in Washington, DC, and several committee members participated in the "teacher conversation" meetings sponsored by PDE. Additionally, the TC's participation as a member of the state RL advisory committee contributed to the committee's overall understanding of RL.

Major Activities

Descriptions of ELANCO High School's preparations for a ninth grade team (1991-92 school year) and experimentation with interdisciplinary instruction are provided below.

Ninth Grade Team Preparation

In the 1990-91 school year, the RL committee was released for four full days to design the ninth grade team initiative. They selected the volunteer team members, designed a flexible schedule, made provisions for appropriate classroom space, and planned for staff development.

The team consists of four teachers: English, science, social studies, and algebra I. They will be responsible for 96 students, and will have four consecutive periods in which to schedule daily instruction, as they decide. They will also have an individual preparation period, a common preparation period, an extra duty period, and one other teaching period each day. Overall, they will have a five-period teaching load instead of the usual six. A student advisory time will be built into each week, and English/communications will be taught as part of an "integrated-writing-across-the-curriculum" approach. That is, there will be no separate English sections, per se. The team will attempt to follow RL's principles and will attempt to define "exit" skills when they begin to design their lessons and interdisciplinary instruction this summer.

Experiment With Interdisciplinary Instruction

To promote staff understanding of interdisciplinary instruction (i.e., less-is-more) and teaming, the RL committee invited the faculty to collaborate with one another in the teaching of an interdisciplinary lesson or unit. As part of this initiative, the committee communicated in writing with the rest of the faculty three times, posted schedules in the building to show teachers who was free to collaborate during a given period, and distributed information on cross-curricular lesson design, along with a condensed version of a model interdisciplinary unit.

The TC reported that the experiment was a success. Eighteen groups of two or three teachers volunteered, and planned and taught interdisciplinary lessons/units which ranged from a single period to five or six periods over three weeks. Some of the subject area groupings were: geometry and art, creative writing and art, English and science, anthropology and mathematics, and industrial arts and applied geometry.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effects of Re:Learning

Since ELANCO High School's RL initiative is still primarily in the planning and development stage, it is not feasible to comment on student or parent reactions. However, the TC reported: "The committee feels it has a clearer idea of where it's headed with RL, and staff in general seem to have a better understanding of what RL involves. There also have been no significant negative reactions to RL from the faculty." In fact, he felt that RL's presence in the building had induced the faculty to be more concerned with the nature and effectiveness of their teaching.

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

The TC cited as enablers: the former assistant superintendent's leadership regarding RL, the enthusiasm of the teachers on the RL committee, the faculty's positive response to the experiment with interdisciplinary lessons/units, the continued support of the board, the encouragement and positive response given to the committee by a group of visitors from the Lehigh University School Study Council, and the support of the current central office administration, as evidenced by their changing the high school schedule in 1990-91 to an eight-period, six-day cycle to accommodate RL's need for double periods.

Barriers

Among the reported barriers encountered were: continued mixed faculty reactions to the nine principles, particularly "teachers as generalists first"; mixed reactions to the eight-period, six-day cycle (about a 50-50 split among staff); staff questions and uncertainties about authentic assessment and college admission needs; the need to involve the principal more fully; the RL committee's difficulties in the first half of the year in finding a common meeting time; the "turf problems" over proposed curriculum changes with the advisory council; and the usual problems encountered in trying to get people to change and think differently about education and instruction.

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation of two or three staff in the state's TREK, participation of the ninth grade team in the state's four-day Shippensburg curriculum institute, a week or more of curriculum development by the ninth grade team, and a day-long meeting of the RL committee to finalize preparations for the 1991-92 school year.

The primary 1991-92 school year activity will be the implementation of the ninth grade team. Related activities will include contacts with parents and the community, and continued planning to expand the high school's RL initiative.

ELIZABETHTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT:
ELIZABETHTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 5 elementary, 1 middle, 1 high school

Student Enrollment: 3,147 students (growing)

Student Population: 97 percent white, 0.5 percent black, 0.5 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Other

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $2,376

Number of Teachers: 87 elementary, 44 middle, 74 high school

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	3 Assistant/Vice Principals
2 Assistant Superintendents	2 Supervisors or Coordinators
5 Principals	18 Department Heads

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

High school, grades 9-12, 964 students, 74 teachers

High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Team Member Committee, 12 teachers
Team Leader Committee, 4 teachers, 1 principal
Ninth grade team, 4 teachers, 118 students
Tenth grade team, 4 teachers, 97 students
Eleventh grade team, 4 teachers, 105 students

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

The high school has experimented with interdisciplinary teaching teams (math, science, social studies, and English) at the 9th, 10th, and 11th grades. This activity was continued in the 1990-91 school year.

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

Most concerns are related to the growing student population and the need for a realistic building program. Significant discussion of these topics and related matters (schedules, teaming, programs) are in progress.

Description of the Community:

Elizabethtown is a rural-suburban area midway between Lancaster and Harrisburg. The area is experiencing significant population growth. Construction and taxes are increasing. All district buildings are involved in major renovation efforts. The present school board and the majority of the community support the renovation activities. However, the elderly segment of the population has raised serious concerns over costs and taxes.

Overview

Elizabethtown is one of two Pennsylvania RL school sites that also are members of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). Elizabethtown became a CES site in 1984. From 1984-1988, school staff engaged in considerable dialogue about CES' nine principles. A "coalition committee" of nine staff, chaired by the high school principal, led the district's exploration of RL during that time.

In 1988, the district joined Pennsylvania's RL initiative, and moved more systematically to act on the Coalition's principles. In the 1989-90 school year, three four-person interdisciplinary teaching teams were formed; one each at the ninth, tenth and eleventh grade levels. Scheduling did not permit these teams to have common within-team groupings of students. Nevertheless, the high school experimented with the team structure and several pilot interdisciplinary units.

In 1990-91, efforts were made to provide each team with a common group of students, and experimentation with CES' principles continued. Elizabethtown also enacted a ninth grade community service component as part of its RL initiative.

Plans for 1991-92 include: the creation of additional teaching teams at the ninth and tenth grade levels, more systematic work on the development of interdisciplinary units, expansion of the community service component, and continued RL-related training for involved staff.

Leadership, Management, and Support

Elizabethtown High School's RL committee structure, the coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. The TC's reflections on the progress made to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also addressed.

Committee Structure

The current committee structure consists of the following. The district-wide coalition committee grew from nine staff in the summer of 1989 to 25 people during the 1989-90 school year. This steering group met about every other month to set policy and provide general direction to the initiative. The twelve teachers on the grade-level teams met monthly to coordinate their activities. Additionally, the three team leaders and the teacher coordinator (a team member) met monthly with the high school principal, who chaired the group's meetings. This group, along with the involved teachers, had the most influence over the day-to-day operation of RL in the high school.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

For several years, the high school principal was the key source of RL/CES leadership in the district. In the 1989-90 school year, the principal recruited a ninth grade math teacher to be the school's RL teacher coordinator, in order to increase staff ownership of RL. The TC chaired the coalition committee's meetings as well as the meetings of the grade-level teachers involved in RL.

He also coordinated visits to the school and, this past year, hosted representatives from about a dozen other school districts. He noted that one of his biggest problems in 1990-91 was that he did not have a free period set aside to coordinate the visits. In his role as TC, he said he also decided which staff to send to training, meetings, conferences, etc.; and he also recruited staff for RL.

Overall, he indicated that he and the principal (a CES Thompson Fellow) worked together as a team to direct the project; they made the decisions as to how the dollars would be allocated after receiving input from the various committees. He reported that the principal "gave up a lot of the control over the project and shared it with the faculty during the past two years." He indicated that some major decisions were put to faculty vote, while others were not. For example, the faculty voted on whether to institute a nine-period day. On the other hand, he said he and the principal decided that RL team members, in 1990-91, would teach only four periods a day and have no extra duty periods. This decision was made to accommodate student scheduling.

Administrative Support

The TC reported that central office administrators and the board had generally been quite supportive of RL over the past several years. A problem occurred toward the end of the 1990-91 school year, however, when the board became aware that some of the RL class sizes were larger than the board's goal of 25 students per class. This occurred when RL teachers' schedules were changed from a five-period teaching day (1989-90) to a four-period teaching day (1990-91) to accommodate the scheduling of common groups of students for each of the three grade-level teams (class sizes increased four or five students per class on the RL teams). The superintendent said he could not justify the larger class sizes in RL, and indicated that the RL staff would have to go back to a five-period teaching day. According to the TC, this policy change would likely preclude the planned formation of any new grade-level teams in 1991-92.

The high school principal, the prime advocate of RL in the district, "has been a key link with the superintendent and fights for the program," according to the TC. The TC said, "He (the principal) has been very active in support of RL. He and the assistant principal worked for hours on the hand-scheduling of common groups of students for the three grade-level teams. He was also quite involved in hosting visitors from other schools in 1990-91."

Financial Support

In 1990-91, Elizabethtown spent its $14,000 from the state as follows. About one-sixth of the money was spent to pay stipends for the team leaders and teacher coordinator ($500 per team leader and $1,000 for the TC). Another sixth was used to pay RL teachers' for after-school meetings and summer curriculum work. One-third was used to send staff to RL-related meetings and conferences. The remaining one-third will be used to send five or six staff to CES' 1991 fall forum. The TC noted that the district picked up the cost of substitutes for RL staff as needed. He had no dollar figures for that district expenditure. Overall, he said, "The board is supportive of RL's ideas/philosophy, but relatively tight in these economic times with the dollars for RL support."

Reflections

The following refections were offered by the TC on project leadership and support. Although very satisfied with previous levels of central office and board support, he was uncertain of the impact that the proposed return to a five-period teaching day would have on RL's implementation in the school.

He reported that a collegial relationship had developed within and among the three teams of RL teachers. He stated: "Our teams themselves work great together. Discussion is focused on classroom implementation, sharing, and fine-tuning, and there is a sense of shared leadership. The team leaders and the principal share in the decisionmaking."

Additionally, he indicated that, although conflicts with the rest of the faculty still exist, particularly over the RL staff's four-period teaching day, there was some indication that some of the faculty were becoming more accepting of RL. As evidence, he cited the fact that a dozen staff (prospective team members) showed up for an after-school meeting/social to discuss the proposed formation of a new tenth grade team.

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

As cited above, the coalition committee, the TC, team leaders, and team members attempted to interest other faculty in becoming prospective new team members in 1990-91. Early in the school year, a special presentation was made to the faculty to explain the RL staffs' four period teaching day, and the nature of the work that they would be engaged in during their non-teaching periods. The TC said, "We developed two handouts for the faculty, explaining RL teachers' teaching and non-teaching activities, and also documented what we did in our non-teaching periods." Throughout the remainder of the year, the faculty at large were kept informed of the project's progress through briefings at monthly faculty meetings. Individual contacts were also made, as the opportunity presented itself, to recruit staff through "one-on-one" discussions and/or to chat with various non-supportive faculty to explain RL.

Close contact with the board was maintained through three formal board presentations on the project's progress by the principal, TC, and other RL staff.

Although there were no formal RL outreach efforts to the parents or community in general, a RL parents' night was held in October 1990, and the RL teachers met individually with the parents to explain the RL initiative's goals and procedures.

Activities to increase staff capacity to implement RL have been ongoing. In previous years, selected staff participated in a CES-sponsored TREK, and attended CES workshops at Brown University on math, arts and the humanities, and exhibitions. The principal received intensive RL/CES-related training as a Thompson Fellow in April 1991.

Re:Learning staff participated in various state-sponsored meetings in 1990-91. In addition, the coalition committee required all staff to draft a

written "testimonial" whenever they attended a workshop or "teacher conversation." In a few paragraphs, they had to address: what they did; what they saw, learned, or experienced that was of use; and how they planned to apply their new knowledge. These "testimonials" were shared with other RL staff, and with the board via the administrative staff.

The three grade-level teams also worked for two days in the summer of 1990 on the groundwork for two interdisciplinary courses at each grade level. An elective "arts and humanities" course was also developed last summer by two teachers; however, no students signed up for it in 1990-91.

Finally, the TC reported that the teams had engaged the students in some cooperative learning activities. He noted that they had not received formal training in cooperative learning; however, such training was under consideration.

Major Activities

Descriptions of Elizabethtown's grade-level teams, personalization, community service, and planning activities are provided below.

Grade Level Teams

Particular effort was made in 1990-91 to assign a common core of students to the high school's ninth, tenth and eleventh grade RL teaching teams. Respectively, the teams were assigned 118, 97, and 105 students. These figures represent approximately one-half the student body at each of those grade levels. Each team was composed of four volunteer teachers: English, math, science and social studies. Team members taught four periods and had three non-teaching periods. These were used for personal planning, team planning, and tutorials. During the tutorial period, the RL staff provided assistance to students on an individual or small group basis.

During the year, each team piloted a minimum of two, three to five-day interdisciplinary units. Examples of the interdisciplinary units piloted were: newspaper production (contents, organization, editing, printing, advertising, costs, etc.); nuclear waste (issues, procedures, alternatives, etc.); solid waste (issues, procedures, alternatives, etc.); and black history (awareness and issues). As part of the requirement for the above units, tenth and eleventh grade RL students were required to do independent research activities.

Overall, the TC reported that the RL staff were at the beginning stages of working with interdisciplinary units and exhibitions. He indicated the staff had yet to address the development of essential questions, common/simple goals (less-is-more), and exit performance criteria. He felt that "much more time would be needed to modify the curriculum vis-a-vis RL's principles." For example, he noted that the school still administers finals in each subject area, and that teachers, quite understandably, are still teaching to them. Additionally, although the team structure has been adopted, students are still grouped within teams at each grade level (i.e., there are two levels of science, math, English, and social studies at each grade level).

He expected that, "This (the finals and within-subject levels) would have to change along with the curriculum."

He also felt that "applying CES' principles, school-wide, would be a slow process, requiring several more years," and that "work with students to help them develop independent study habits and skills needed to be addressed at the lower grade levels (to provide the readiness for students' to use their minds well in high school)."

Personalization

At the beginning of the school year, RL team members contacted and personally interviewed (10-15 minutes) their assigned students, in order to get to know them, determine their interests, and collect information for a student folder. All students were required to maintain a "personal journal" and make brief entries once or twice a week regarding their current life/school experiences and feelings. During the year, on a monthly basis, the teachers read excerpts, selected by the students. According to the TC, "the journal process and the tutorials helped us to get to know the students much better than we ordinarily would have."

Community Service

Elizabethtown incorporated an evolving, student home/community service component into its RL agenda. Currently, ninth and tenth graders participate in an annual, one-day community service activity. In 1989-90, they helped clean a local stream and analyzed the purity of the water. In 1990-91, they helped collect and mulch Christmas trees. Ultimately, 50 hours of service activities (small group work for eleventh graders, and individual service work for twelfth graders) will be required of students for graduation. This requirement and the ways students can meet it is still being planned.

Other Planned Activities

The coalition committee had planned to enact a twelfth grade student advisory program in 1990-91. This activity failed to get off the ground, due in part to a lack of monetary resources for three requested teacher aides, and in part to some resistance to RL among the faculty at large. The plan called for the involvement of non-RL faculty at the same time that there were tensions among RL and non-RL staff over the differences in their teaching periods/extra duties. In that context, the committee decided to postpone the advisory initiative.

Committee plans to form another ninth and another tenth grade team for 1991-92 may be postponed if RL teachers are required to teach five periods a day. Most students have two or three elective classes each day, in addition to their four core classes. This fact, combined with a five period teaching day for RL staff, severely complicates the task of scheduling core groups of students with teams of teachers.

Effects of Re:Learning

Staff responses to RL, and the responses of students and parents are presented below.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

The responses of the great majority of the 12 teachers involved in teaming has been quite positive, according to the TC. Speaking for the group, he said:

> Teaming has permitted us to get to know the students much better. We have been able to schedule our tests, so that they do not all occur on one day. We have been able to coordinate our content and interrelate our lessons, because we now know (for the first time in years) what the other teachers are teaching. The tutorials have enabled us to give more attention to students. We are also getting more involved in dealing with attendance and discipline problems; we help students individually. In fact, we experienced fewer discipline problems this year on the teams, and the climate between students and teachers is changing for the better. Plus, we have more flexibility in scheduling our daily classes, and working with and/or covering for one another.

The responses of the non-RL faculty remain mixed. Some elective teachers are still concerned over their jobs, and there have been some negative reactions to the RL teachers' four-period teaching day. The TC, however, was optimistic. He said, "If given enough time and support, I think we can win people over."

Student and Parent Responses to Teaming

According to the TC, both student and parent responses to the teaming arrangement have generally been positive; "both the students and their parents feel that we know the students better and are giving them more attention." The only issue that surfaced in 1990-91 involved an independent research assignment for the tenth graders. The TC reported, "Some of the tenth grade parents objected to the assignment, stating that it was too much for the students."

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as enablers were: the positive working relationship between the TC and the principal, the cooperation and leadership of the team leaders, the enthusiasm of the RL teachers, the backing of the superintendent, and the structural changes in teaming and student grouping. The TC stressed the

following: "We had common students this past year. That allowed us to do a lot that we couldn't have done otherwise. The four-period teaching day is crucial to the implementation of RL."

Barriers

"The biggest barriers," according to the TC, "have been the RL class size issue and the dissension among staff over the RL staffs' four-period teaching day."

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation of four staff in PDE's RL curriculum workshop, participation of one or two staff in the Pennsylvania TREK, and the development of two additional interdisciplinary units by each team.

Proposed activities in 1991-92 include the continuation of the current ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade teams, and the possible addition of another ninth and another tenth grade team. Several staff may also participate in CES' fall forum, if funds are available.

NEW HOPE-SOLEBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT:
JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 1 elementary, 1 junior-senior high school

Student Enrollment: 800 students (growing slowly)

Student Population: 98 percent white, 1 percent black, 1 percent other

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $8,563

Number of Teachers: 30 elementary, 35 secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	4 Half-time Supervisors or Coordinators
2 Principals	3 Department Heads
2 Half-time Student Deans	6 Grade-Level Chairs

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

Junior-Senior High School, grades 7-12, 350 students, 35 teachers

Junior-Senior High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Re:Learning Steering Committee, 22 teachers, 2 administrators, 1 board member, and 1 parent
Seventh grade cross curricular project, 7 teachers, 60 students
Eighth grade English and Social Studies combined, 1 teacher, 15 students

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

The district has been involved in upgrading the curriculum to incorporate higher order thinking skills, implementing PCRPII-Reading and Writing across the curriculum, restructuring the gifted/honors program for academically talented and/or motivated students, and experimenting with several CES principles (e.g., student-as-worker/teacher-as-coach, personalization).

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

The most controversial recent issue was the embezzlement of $2.2 million by the former business manager. Other activities that attracted attention were the turnover in district administration (new superintendent, business manager, and high school principal), the change in the secondary curriculum advanced placement courses, the revision of the gifted program, and the election of a new board which is now split over several key issues.

Description of the Community:

The New Hope-Solebury School District is composed of New Hope Borough and Solebury Township in the eastern part of Bucks County. The two communities

have been well-known for years as a center for the arts. The area is primarily rural and residential with a large portion of its residents commuting to the Philadelphia, New York, and Princeton areas. While generally considered an affluent community, the New Hope-Solebury School District enjoys the lowest school tax millage rate in Bucks County. The 1990-91 millage rate is 122.8.

Overview

Since early 1989, New Hope-Solebury's superintendent has been the primary source of leadership regarding the district's involvement in Re:Learning. In the course of that time, the district engaged in extensive RL exploratory, planning and capacity-building activities. In the past year, the leadership of the RL initiative was turned over to the high school principal, and he assumed the responsibility for coordinating RL activities in the 1990-91 school year.

The major focus of RL implementation has been at the junior-senior high level. School staff have focused on the RL principles of student-as-worker, intellectual focus, personalization, exhibitions, and less-is-more (i.e., the development of essential questions and interdisciplinary curricula). Implementation activities in 1990-91 involved: interdisciplinary teaching by teachers in the school's seventh grade cross-curricular project, the coordination of two English and social studies courses, and the pilot implementation of several student exhibitions.

Planned activities for 1991-92 include: significant revisions to the seventh through eleventh grade core curriculum (i.e., infusion of essential questions), continuation of the seventh grade cross-curricular project, the possible formation of an eighth grade cross-curricular project, and the continued piloting of student exhibitions.

Leadership, Management, and Support

New Hope-Solebury Junior-Senior High School's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. Reflections on the progress made in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also described.

Committee Structure

New Hope-Solebury's current RL steering committee consists of approximately 28 staff, which represents an increase of about 12 teachers since early 1990. The district policy has been to add individuals to the committee upon their participation in an RL event (e.g., attending a RL-related workshop and/or incorporating some aspect of RL into their classroom pedagogy or curriculum). The committee consists of the superintendent, the high school principal, a parent, a board member, 22 junior-senior high teachers, an elementary reading teacher, and an elementary librarian. The committee typically meets once or twice a month for about one and one-half hours after school.

The committee acts as a whole, and makes decisions about the direction RL will take in the district, the interpretation of CES' principles, workshop attendance and scheduling, and mini-grant proposal funding. Votes are taken when needed, and a simple majority rules. For example, toward the end of the 1990-91 school year, the district had about $5,000 left in its RL budget. The money was used to fund mini-grant proposals solicited from teachers. The committee rated, discussed, and voted on the 12 proposals submitted. It funded eight, all of which will support teachers' summer RL-related curriculum revision work.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

In 1990-91 New Hope-Solebury chose not to have a teacher coordinator. Due to the relatively small size of the school's staff, the superintendent and high school principal did not feel there was a need to burden a staff person with the RL coordinator role.

Administrative Support

Re:Learning was introduced in the district in 1989, due in large part to the superintendent's strong support for the initiative. The superintendent played the most visible RL leadership role up to the end of the 1989-90 school year. A new high school principal, with knowledge of the Coalition, was hired in 1989-90. At the superintendent's request, the principal assumed, in 1990-91, the primary leadership role for RL in the district; he chaired the RL committee meetings, and coordinated RL activities in the district.

According to the principal, the board is very supportive, wants to see RL do well, and wants to know how RL will impact students when they go on to college. The principal also noted that RL has the support of the teachers' association. The association president and three officers are on the RL committee.

Regarding his role, the principal commented:

> I've assumed the primary leadership for RL in the building and in the district (we now have elementary staff on the committee). I'm spending more time on RL matters. I favor the development of interdisciplinary units. I'm supportive of teachers meeting together to develop rubrics for the interdisciplinary units. However, there are differences in grading practices and subject matter emphasis among teachers, within subject areas. Teachers need to decide what the most important learnings in the subject areas are. We also need to be teaching higher order thinking skills, with teachers coaching and students directing their own learning.

Financial Support

The district received $14,000 from the state to support its RL activities; these were matched by the district. About one-half was spent on professional development (i.e., presenters' fees and compensation for staff time). A quarter was spent on substitutes to provide teachers with common

planning time, and one-quarter was spent on curriculum development (i.e., materials, teachers' time). Overall, according to the principal, there was a need for even more common planning time for teachers.

Reflections

The principal offered the following reflections on shared project leadership. He said, "We've expanded our RL committee, and we're engaged in an ongoing discussion of what's best for our students and how best to implement our RL program." He also felt that the faculty was pleased that he had assumed the role of the RL facilitator (coordinator).

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

There is a general understanding among the New Hope-Solebury faculty that teachers who volunteer to participate in a project event will be invited to become members of the RL steering committee. About sixty-five percent of the junior-senior high school faculty are involved in some manner in RL, and no one has dropped off the steering committee. Additionally, the superintendent and principal are in daily communication and promote the project regularly. The superintendent deals with the community at large, and the principal deals mostly with in-school RL communications. Two or three district newsletters are published annually. The principal also prepared two newsletters for staff and parents in 1990-91. There was no local press coverage of RL this past year.

New Hope-Solebury conducted the following staff development activities in 1990-91 to build staff capacity to implement RL. The district arranged to have Grant Wiggins conduct five three-hour, after-school training sessions on performance assessment. Approximately one-third of the elementary, junior high, and senior high staff participated in the performance assessment training. The district also conducted regularly scheduled inservice sessions on the following: higher order thinking skills, paradigms of the thinking process, coping with change, implementing current thinking programs, problem solving related to assessing students' educational projects, and strategies for continuing the implementation of the district's programs.

The principal indicated that the district is working to incorporate the Coalition's principles. He said, "We want to create a different kind of educational setting; one which induces students to think, and one in which student progress is assessed via essays, portfolios, and/or exhibitions of mastery." From his perspective, the training activities cited above were related to the infusion of performance assessment into the various courses the school's teachers offer.

Major Activities

The district's RL-related activities at the seventh, eighth, and eleventh grades are described below. Also described are examples of the exhibitions conducted in 1990-91.

Seventh Grade

In 1990-91, the teachers involved in the district's seventh grade cross-curricular project were provided a common planning period; however, they did not have common subsets of students for back-to-back periods. Nevertheless, with the principal's assistance (e.g., coordination and scheduling) seven seventh grade teachers prepared and carried out a five-week interdisciplinary unit, involving 60 students. This pilot RL activity served as a learning experience for staff. Among other things, it surfaced among staff the issue of "how to grade" student performances, and resulted in considerable staff discussion of common criteria. This year, students were shown examples of last year's students' exhibitions to facilitate their understanding of what was expected. Student exhibitions were carried out after school and were assessed by a panel using multiple criteria.

Eighth Grade

At the eighth grade level, an English and a social studies teacher coordinated their course activities (American literature and history) in 1990-91, and implemented one interdisciplinary unit. Their efforts proved to be challenging in that they had no common planning period and their classes were not scheduled back-to-back. According to the principal, the latter two problems or barriers will be rectified in 1991-92. He also noted that the two teachers will add one interdisciplinary unit a year over the next three years until they have one unit for each marking period.

Eleventh Grade

At the eleventh grade level, one teacher taught a combined English and social studies class during a daily two-period block of time. The principal reported that the 15 students loved the interdisciplinary course, and that it would be repeated next year.

Exhibitions

As an example of the types of exhibitions New Hope-Solebury is attempting to infuse in its courses, the principal cited the Spanish "news report exhibition" (i.e., script, dialogue, weather, news, cultural events, sports, commentary) put on for the second year in a row by fifteen students as a part of the Spanish IV class. He noted that a similar exhibition was incorporated into the French class during the past school year.

The seventh grade students also put on several exhibitions related to an interdisciplinary unit on animals. The exhibitions were rated by panels consisting of an intermediate unit staff person, a parent from the Home-School Association, two teachers, and a high-school senior. All exhibitions were presented after school and were video-taped.

Effects of Re:Learning

Staff responses to RL and the responses of students and parents are presented below.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

The principal felt that the faculty were generally positive toward RL, but suspicious that it might eventually dry up and die. He perceived that staff were less threatened this year, more involved in conversations within subject areas and grade levels, and more willing to apply RL's principles in their classes. He also felt that the teachers were more aware of their students as individuals due to the grade-level meetings related to interdisciplinary work. Overall, he said, "We are breaking down the isolation of teachers."

Responses of Students and Parents

From the principal's perspective, the school was still developing and fine tuning discrete pilots of RL. He indicated it was too soon for most students to have noticed any major changes; however, he hoped that next year they would be more aware of the changes being made. Regarding those students involved in the pilot implementation of RL, he felt that they were very pleased with the experience and definitely more actively engaged in learning. He noted that there was a decrease in absences and discipline infractions among the students involved in RL in the past year.

As to parents' reactions, the principal reported that about 25 parents from the Home-School Association had direct contact with RL through their presence at the 12 after-school exhibitions conducted in 1990-91. The parents were very positive about the students' exhibitions, and expressed their desires to have their children involved in future exhibitions. He also felt that parents were becoming more accepting of the idea that there was not one right answer to some school assignments. That is, how students interpret and apply data (to solve a problem) can be different but acceptable.

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are described below.

Enablers

Cited as enablers were: the general support of parents, teachers, and students; the expansion of the RL steering committee; the contribution of Grant Wiggins, a national trainer who assured the staff that the district's problems with developing performance assessments were the same as other districts throughout the country; the cross-curriculum work of faculty; the "teacher conversation" meetings sponsored by the state, and the perception by staff that the superintendent and principal strongly support RL.

Barriers

Among the reported barriers encountered were: the problems involved in scheduling students (and staff) to facilitate the co-teaching of courses (e.g., back-to-back teaching periods and common planning time for teachers); continuing conflicts with the state's Chapter 5 curriculum guidelines (the

district was cited in an April 1991 state audit for not having 30 contiguous hours of instructional time on environmental education) which pose barriers to interdisciplinary teaching; the continuing mindset of teachers to view themselves as teachers of one subject, instead of being generalists; the difficulties faced by teachers in coming up with connections between their subject matters and their real-life applications; and finding the time for teachers to talk and plan together (i.e., "If they are taken out of class, the board and parents feel you are taking away from instruction; if its done in the summer, that's not really the best time.").

The principal stressed the difficulties which scheduling poses to RL in a small high school. He said, "We offer 126 courses, 70 percent of which are singletons, and we have very few staff to move around." He indicated that the scheduling involved to accommodate the five-week pilot interdisciplinary unit by the seventh grade teachers "was unbelievable."

Anticipated Activities

The district plans to engage a number of faculty in a full week of curriculum work this summer. The intent is to rewrite the curriculum with an emphasis on defining essential questions for the following subjects: English (grades 7-11), social studies (grades 7 and 8), science (grades 7-9), and mathematics (geometry, algebra, algebra II, and calculus).

Anticipated implementation activities in 1991-92 include: continuation of the seventh grade cross-curricular team/project, and the provision of common planning periods for the involved teachers; and the formation of an eighth grade cross-curricular team/project (English and social studies will be co-taught, and math and science will be co-taught). Three staff members at the seventh, and three at the eighth grade levels will be provided common planning time during periods one and five. The three teachers at each grade level (7 and 8) will also have 60 students in common during periods two, three, and four. This arrangement should facilitate interdisciplinary team teaching. The possibility of forming a ninth grade team is also under discussion. Additionally, the teaching of math and science will be combined at the twelfth grade.

SUB-DISTRICT SIX OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA: ALTERNATIVE FOR THE MIDDLE YEARS SCHOOL (AMY-6)

Demographic Profile

Schools: 23 elementary, 5 middle, 8 high schools

Student Enrollment: 27,853 students (growing)

Student Population at AMY-6: 27 percent white, 69 percent black, 4 percent Hispanic

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $3,700

Number of Teachers: 729 elementary and secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors in Sub-District 6:

1 Superintendent (District)
2 Assistants to the District Superintendent
36 Principals
23 Assistant/Vice Principals
18 Supervisors or Coordinators
1 District Special Education Administrator

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

AMY-6, grades 6-8, 230 students, 18 teachers

AMY-6 Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

School Governance Council, 1 administrator, 4 parents, 1 teachers' association representative, 1 para-professional, 7 teachers
Sixth, seventh and eighth grade teaching teams, 5 teachers per team, 75-80 students per team

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

The entire School District of Philadelphia is involved in ongoing school improvement efforts. Each school has a school improvement plan (3-year plan) which addresses student learning needs identified by the staff. In addition, certain schools may have more elaborate plans as a result of participating in specific programs (e.g., Re:Learning, Chapter 1).

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

An ongoing issue is student performance on city and state tests. Drop-out prevention and support to ninth graders, as well as restructuring at the high school level, are additional concerns.

Description of the Community:

Philadelphia, with an estimated population of 1.68 million, is the second largest city on the east coast and the fifth largest in the country. Known for its rich historical and cultural attractions, the city is also a major

port and center of business and industry. The School District of Philadelphia consists of seven sub-districts serving 197,000 urban students.

Overview

Alternative for the Middle Years School 6 (AMY-6) was accepted into the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) in December 1988, and became a member of Pennsylvania's RL initiative in the spring of 1989. The principal played the primary leadership role in involving the school in CES/RL.

The school's CES activities were initially guided by a 15-person steering committee led by the principal (March 1988 to January 1990). In January 1990, a four-person cadre (RL teacher coordinator, researcher, evaluator, and principal) was formed, and RL's leadership was shared among the coordinator, cadre members, and school staff. Early in the 1990-91 school year, the school applied for "experimental school status" in the Philadelphia School District to facilitate its RL activities. The School District requested that a school governance council be established as a prerequisite to granting AMY-6 experimental school status. The governance council was formed and met twice before the end of the 1990-91 school year. As of June 1991, the interface between the RL cadre and the governance council remained to be determined.

AMY-6 engaged in extensive RL exploratory and capacity building activities from mid-1988 through June 1991. In the 1989-90 school year, a core group of volunteer seventh grade teachers commenced pilot RL implementation activities. Concurrently, four RL committees (curriculum, assessment, social responsibilities, and parent as collaborator) met throughout the year. The committees' recommendations (May 1990) were acted upon by the cadre and staff in the 1990-91 school year. In 1990-91, grade-level teams, each comprised of five teachers working with 75-80 students, were mandated at each grade level (6, 7, and 8). A student advisory program also was enacted. By the end of 1990-91, all of the school's faculty were nominally involved in RL, and the great majority supported RL.

Significant progress has been made to date in personalizing teaching and learning, engaging students-as-workers, and enhancing the school's climate. Anticipated activities in 1991-92 include: continuation of the grade-level team approach and continued work on defining essential questions, developing/piloting interdisciplinary courses, and developing/refining procedures and criteria for students' exhibitions.

Leadership, Management, and Support

AMY-6's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. Reflections on the progress made to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL also are described.

Committee Structure

The school's initial RL steering committee was replaced by an elected RL cadre in January 1990. The cadre consisted of an RL teacher coordinator, an

evaluator, a researcher, and the building principal. Both the evaluator's and the researcher's titles and roles were more nominal than functional. To date, they have assisted with tracking the budget for RL and acquiring/disseminating RL-related information, respectively. The cadre was primarily active from February 1990 through December 1990, and met every other week for about three hours in the evening. Cadre meetings were open to all staff; however, only a few staff attended on occasion. The cadre solicited the active involvement of the chairs of the school's four standing RL committees (curriculum, assessment, social responsibility, and parent as collaborator) in its meetings on an as-needed basis. Cadre members were reimbursed for their time during formal meetings at an hourly rate from funds derived from the state's RL grant. The cadre was charged with: developing RL building plans, overseeing the implementation of various RL activities, deciding how to spend the $14,000 state RL grant, funding RL committee and development work, selecting staff for conference/meeting attendance, and generally setting the direction of RL in the building. According to the TC, significant staff input was sought prior to making major decisions. The TC chaired the cadre meetings and decisions were made by group discussion and consensus.

The school's four RL committees, each staffed by five to seven volunteer teachers, continued their activities in the 1990-91 school year. For example, the Alternative Assessment Committee members engaged in a lot of reading and research on alternative assessment. Each committee acted on some of its May 1990 report recommendations during the first several months of the school year.

As a result of the four committees' May 1990 recommendations, AMY-6 also applied for "experimental school status" within the Philadelphia School District in the early fall of 1990. In compliance with district central office requirements for experimental schools, the school established a site-based governance council by mid-school year, and conducted two meetings of the council by the end of the school year. The governance council consists of the principal, the teachers' association building representative, a paraprofessional representative, seven teachers and four parents.

Concurrent with the above activities, the school's focus on RL was partially interdicted by a central office announcement in January 1991 that the school was targeted to be closed at the end of the 1990-91 school year, due to district-wide cutbacks forced by scarce resources. An ad-hoc "Save AMY-6 Committee," composed of parents and school staff, was formed at the initiation of the parents. After several meetings with central office staff, the school was granted a one-year extension by the superintendent. A spin-off effect of the "Save AMY-6 Committee" was that it surfaced a number of parent leaders. Four of these parents subsequently became "parent representatives" on the site-based governance council that was formed in the late spring of 1991.

The RL cadre which had met regularly through December 1990, met less frequently in the second half of the school year due to the work that was required to save AMY-6 and the work involved in establishing a governance council. At the time of this report, the relationship between the governance council and the RL cadre had yet to be worked out. However, the experimental status of the school, as well as its existence, was assured for 1991-92.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

The TC was responsible for chairing and setting the agenda for the RL cadre. She reported that she worked closely with the principal, particularly with regard to setting up the school's agenda for staff development, and with regard to the cadre's work in preparing a "Twenty-First Century Nabisco" grant proposal. She felt she was more visible as the coordinator this year, and reported that the principal had "released formal control of the cadre to her." She also indicated that she spent a good deal of time in 1990-91 hosting visitors to the school.

Administrative Support

The principal has been the guiding force behind the school's involvement in CES/RL since 1988. The TC reported, "The principal more or less chaired things in the first few years of RL. This year it changed. She shifted her role toward more shared decision-making, and there has been more interactive decision-making with the staff, rather than the cadre making decisions on its own."

RL also has the support of both the sub-district and district superintendents. They signed-off on the school's initial participation in RL. Additionally, a board member visited the school for a day this year to learn about RL.

Financial Support

The school's primary source of RL financial support came from the state's $14,000 grant. Although the money was authorized in October 1990, the school did not receive it until February 1991. The TC felt that the state needed to find a way to get the RL grant monies to districts earlier in the school year. By the end of the 1990-91 school year, AMY-6 used about half of the state monies on the following: reimbursements to staff for curriculum development work and for the cadre's time, to support a visit by a CES Citibank Fellow, and for substitutes and staff travel. It was indicated that the remainder of the money would be expended in the summer of 1991 to support staff curriculum development work, and capacity building-related travel. The school also obtained a small grant from the Exxon Foundation, which was used to build staff capacity in socratic seminar techniques.

Reflections

The following reflections were offered by the TC on leadership and increasing shared decisionmaking. The TC said, "There has been a major shift in expanding the shared leadership for the project and an increase in collegial decisionmaking." She attributed the changes to: the school's involvement in CES/RL, the principal's intent to promote shared leadership, the extensive training staff have received as a result of RL, and the district's requirement that a site-based governance council be formed. She also indicated that, as a result of the latter requirement, the teachers' association was now formally involved in the initiative; the association worked with the RL cadre in setting up the waivers requested in the school's experimental school application, and in establishing the governance council. Additionally, several meetings with the faculty were held to hammer out the experimental

school application. It was rewritten twice to incorporate faculty input, and was finally approved on the third vote by more than 75 percent of the school's staff. Overall, the TC felt that as a result of the activities cited above, "staff commitment to and participation in RL deepened during the 1990-91 school year."

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

In the past year, the cadre continued its efforts to build staff understanding of the project. Copies of "Horace" were distributed as they came out, the minutes of cadre meetings were distributed, the large Coalition bulletin board in the staff lounge was kept current, and staff were offered multiple opportunities to participate in RL-related meetings and staff development activities. Of even greater significance, however, was the principal's decision to place all staff on grade-level teams in 1990-91, and provide them with common planning time. Although the decision was not popular with all staff (i.e., some staff wanted more class time instead of common team planning time), the TC felt that the mandated team structure and subsequent team work resulted in increased understanding of RL and greater staff commitment.

The TC said, "In the first year and a half of the project, a group of seventh grade teachers volunteered to participate in RL as a team." Other staff were supportive, but reluctant to volunteer. The principal decided it was time to induce all staff to confront the realities of RL. Her decision was based in part on the May 1990 recommendations of the RL curriculum committee. The TC concluded, "It (the mandated team structure) has been difficult this year. Of our 18 teachers and four teacher assistants, we still have two or three staff who are slow in getting more involved; we also have two or three staff who remain philosophically opposed to RL."

Parent and central office awareness of RL were stimulated in 1990-91. The threatened closing of the school, and the related "Save AMY-6 Campaign" by staff and parents, resulted in increased discussion of the school's program. Similarly, the need to create a governance council resulted in increased staff interaction with parents and central office staff. The cadre and faculty's work on the Twenty-First Century Nabisco grant also required a meeting with community and parent representatives. This meeting resulted in a further public airing of the school's RL activities.

In addition to the above activities, the school continued to build its capacity to engage in RL. Specifically, in the summer of 1990:

- seven staff participated in a leadership training workshop at West Chester University, provided by the Southeastern Teacher Leadership Center
- seven staff attended two days of training on the Johns Hopkins' model of cooperative learning in Baltimore, Maryland
- nine staff participated in a week-long, state-sponsored RL activity on curriculum change and restructuring at Shippensburg, Pennsylvania

- the teacher coordinator underwent six days of CES/ECS TREK training in Boulder, Colorado, in order to become a TREK trainer.

During the course of the 1990-91 school year:

- the principal participated in four days of Thompson Fellow training related to the principal's role in RL and to leadership skills at Brown University

- the principal received a week of training on "socratic seminar techniques" with Dennis Gray, and worked with several staff and students on piloting the socratic process in AMY-6's classes. Dennis Gray also did one day of on-site training for AMY-6's staff, and the school held two shorter follow-up sessions for staff interested in applying the process in their classes

- a faculty member from the Crefeld School trained as a CES "Citibank Faculty" member spent a total of five days working with AMY-6's staff. He helped the cadre set up three days of team planning meetings; worked intensively for a full day with each team on the development of curriculum, using a backward planning approach; observed classes; made planning suggestions; and submitted a brief report on the school's climate. AMY-6 also has a staff member (a foreign language teacher who assumed the evaluator role on the RL cadre) who received a week of training at Brown University as a "Citibank Faculty" member in February 1990. He collaborated with his Crefeld counterpart on the activities cited above. Both "Citibank Faculty" received in-depth training in team building/group facilitation skills, and the backward planning approach to interdisciplinary curriculum development

- AMY-6 conducted three one-half day training sessions, led by staff members, on roles on teams, team building, and on interdisciplinary planning. Sample interdisciplinary plans were developed by the teams

- a number of staff participated in several state-sponsored RL meetings (e.g., principal and teacher conversations)

- four staff attended a Coalition-sponsored regional conference in Connecticut on backward curriculum planning

- AMY-6 conducted two one-half day sessions and a short follow-up session for interested staff on the Johnson and Johnson model of cooperative learning

- several staff participated in a CES/ECS conference on "RL in Urban Environments" in Chicago

- AMY-6's principal was chosen to serve on a newly-formed School District of Philadelphia citywide committee charged with exploring alternative assessment. The principal, four staff, and four students conducted a panel presentation on alternative assessment at a one-day meeting of the committee

- several staff members also engaged in exploratory work with PennSERVE, a federally-funded state initiative to promote national and community service.

The TC also commented that the cadre and staff work on the Twenty-First Century Nabisco grant proposal, which the school did not get, was a beneficial staff development exercise. She said, "Our proposal brainstorming/planning activities had positive spin-off effects. They increased our contacts with the community/parents and helped us clarify our RL aims and goals."

Major Activities

Descriptions of AMy-6's team structure and activities, and home-based group and student advisory activities are provided below.

Team Structure and Activities

Based on the recommendations of the RL curriculum committee, AMY-6's sixth and eighth grade teachers were formed into grade-level teams at the beginning of the 1990-91 school year, in an attempt to personalize teaching and learning. The seventh grade teachers had voluntarily worked as a RL team during the previous year and one-half, and continued with their team structure. Each team was comprised of five teachers: English, science, social studies, math, and an elective subject (music, art, or language arts). The teachers' daily schedule consisted of five teaching periods, a personal planning period, a team planning period, lunch, and a brief advisory period.

The TC indicated that the teams worked on "the beginnings of interdisciplinary planning and the various ways to deal with alternative assessment, and were looking toward the use of student portfolios next year, as a product of the planned interdisciplinary and alternative assessment work." The teams also spent a lot of time on the development of essential questions, and they determined that the question, "What is change?," would serve as the central schoolwide theme for the first eight weeks of interdisciplinary work in 1991-92.

In 1990-91, each team continued to use the established citywide standardized curriculum and pacing schedule for core subject areas. The school had requested a waiver of these citywide requirement early in the school year, but was turned down due to the lack of a school governance council at that time. The TC indicated that "having to adhere to the citywide requirements put staff in the position of trying to serve two masters, and constrained efforts to come up with interesting interdisciplinary ideas in the core subject areas."

The established seventh grade team was the only team to try out some alternative assessment procedures (e.g., group presentations, self and peer assessment) and invited parents in to view the presentations (e.g., on such topics as medieval life and times, the environment, and a fantasy country). The TC related, however, that the staff were "just at the beginnings of alternative assessment, and needed more understanding of how to set performance criteria."

Each of the teams used cooperative learning techniques with students to engage them actively in learning (i.e., student-as-worker). The TC indicated that all staff had received training in cooperative learning and that it was being used schoolwide in various ways. She noted, however, that staff were still struggling with how to be "coaches" to students, to the end of having them assume more responsibility for their own learning.

Home-based Groups and Student Advisory

As a result of the work of the RL social responsibility committee, the school instituted a "home-based groups" initiative in 1990-91. The primary goal of the initiative was to involve students in small groups to promote student bonding and feelings of belonging. Throughout the year, cross-grade groups of fourteen students met three times a week for one-half hour with an assigned teacher to deal with social issues, self esteem, and home and school concerns. The social responsibility committee worked in the summer and fall of 1990 to identify and package materials for teachers to use with the students, provide team building activities, and provide teachers with staff development related to the implementation of the "home-based groups" initiative.

AMY-6 also conducted a 15-minute "check-in" advisory period during the morning which involved groupings of students and teachers different from the "home-based groups" initiative.

Effects of Re:Learning

The effects that RL has had to date on staff, students, and parents at AMY-6 are described below.

Overall Staff Responses to RL

It was the TC's perception that the activities associated with the school's involvement in RL, and the grouping of teachers in teams in 1990-91, "had broken the isolation of teachers and affected their behavior in significant ways." She said:

> The most successful aspect of teaming was getting to know the students well. Teachers got more at students' needs and strengths. There was a lot more personalization of learning and communication with parents. Having teachers come together daily to plan with their colleagues, affected teachers in the way they taught things to students. Their day was also different; they had different lengths of teaching time and classes, and worked with students grouped both vertically (across grades) and horizontally. There was more openness, peer coaching, remedial work, and work on students' self-esteem by teachers. Overall, teachers worked in a more participatory fashion in terms of planning, staff development, and curriculum work. Staff commitment to RL also deepened. There was an increase in the time put in on RL this year by all staff.

The TC also reported that she heard a more sophisticated understanding of RL reflected in teachers' informal conversations. She said, "There is more clarity in staff discussions of RL. The level of discussion has deepened; it has focused on pedagogical issues, and on how the CES principles apply to children." She reported hearing fewer personal concerns. She also reported that, although the sixth and eighth grade teachers were initially skeptical of teaming, "they got turned on by it as the year progressed." She reported that all of the teachers said that they got to know the students better, even though they may not have accomplished all of the interdisciplinary work that was planned.

Responses of Students and Parents

Teachers engaged students in dialogue about RL in the second half of the year. According to the TC, the students were overwhelmingly positive and very excited about it. She indicated that a number of students reported that they reflected more about themselves in the learning process. She said, "They are aware of their learning, what they have done, what they might have done differently, and are also aware of learning from each other." The TC also felt that "the students viewed teachers as resources in a lot of different ways; some students even asked to speak with groups of teachers this year."

The parents were very supportive of the school. The TC said, "We heard a lot from parents this year; comments about their childrens' enthusiasm about school, and their wanting to do things and study. There also was more communication with parents; they talked with the whole team and the counselor more often."

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to, or detracted from, the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as important enablers were: the RL support system (financial, training, networking, and moral support) established by the PDE, and the direct support of the RL state coordinator; the climate for change that has been set up by the superintendent of the School District of Philadelphia (i.e., governance councils, decentralization, restructuring); the continued positive support of AMY-6 parents for both the school and its ongoing RL activities; and the connection with CES at Brown (i.e., workshops, contacts, conferences).

Barriers

Time was the most significant barrier encountered. The time and energy required of the TC to carry out RL was quite demanding and detracted from the TC's time for her own students (i.e., interactions with PDE, CES, internal and external meetings and conferences, visitors to the school). The fight to keep AMY-6 alive absorbed a lot of time. All staff were spread too thin. Finding the time needed to write grants to obtain additional RL-related funds is also an issue that remains to be resolved.

Some difficulties were also encountered in trying to involve all staff in RL. The TC noted that the few remaining staff resisters expressed their concerns to the school administration in writing this past year. Their concerns are being treated confidentially and with respect. The TC viewed the above as a positive development. That is, staff concerns that have been clarified and made manifest can at least be confronted and hopefully resolved one way or another, as opposed to engaging in a continuing stalemate over unclarified issues.

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation of seven staff in the state's week long workshop on RL curriculum development, the principal's participation in a week-long Thompson Fellow training session at Brown University, participation of the school's Citibank Faculty member in an additional week of training at Brown University, participation of the TC as a facilitator in the first state-sponsored TREK (one week workshop), and collaborative work by several staff to assist Vare Middle School in Philadelphia embark on its RL initiative.

AMY-6 also expects to obtain waivers from the School District of Philadelphia from participating (in part) in the "citywide test" and accompanying "curriculum pacing schedules" during the 1991-92 school year. Due to a ten percent across-the-board cut in district funds, AMY-6 will also lose three teachers in 1991-92. As a result, all teachers will be requested to teach an elective not in their field next school year.

Next year, AMY-6 plans to continue having all teachers involved in team planning (team planning, however, will likely be reduced to five hours of time every three weeks, instead of 40-minutes per day, four days a week), reorganize the seventh grade team and place some of the seventh grade teachers onto the sixth and eighth grade teams to insure that all teams have experienced RL staff, involve the special education teachers on the grade-level teams, revise the school schedule/roster by blocks of time to provide teachers more flexibility in organizing instruction, involve all teachers in teaching one or more electives, continue the "home-based groups" initiative, commence the school-wide use of essential questions, engage in more systematic work on developing and implementing interdisciplinary units of instruction and student exhibitions, and expand the school's community service program.

TYRONE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT:
TYRONE JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Demographic Profile

Schools: 4 elementary, 1 comprehensive junior-senior high school (grades 7-12)

Student Enrollment: 2,197 (declining slightly)

Student Population: 99.3 percent white, 0.5 percent black, 0.2 percent Asian

Average Per-Pupil Expenditure: $2,774

Number of Teachers: 54 elementary, 62 secondary

Number of Administrators and Supervisors:

1 Superintendent	2 Assistant/Vice Principals
1 Assistant Superintendent	7 Department Heads
3 Principals	7 Grade-Level Chairpersons (elementary)

School(s) Involved in Re:Learning:

Tyrone Area Junior-Senior High School, 980 students, 62 teachers

Junior-Senior High School Staff and Students Involved in Re:Learning:

Grade-Level Team Committees, 8-10 seventh and 8-10 eighth grade teachers, 2 administrators
Seventh grade team, 6 teachers, 110 students
Eighth grade team, 8-10 teachers (planning for 1991-92, 120 students)
Senior high humanities program (in talking stages for 1991-92)

Recent District Improvement Efforts:

In the 1990-91 school year, district staff established goals for each school building in conjunction with staff development, and in preparation for a new long range planning effort. A number of staff development areas (e.g., cooperative learning, Re:Learning, whole language instruction) will be addressed, and staff will begin preparing personal professional development plans in 1991-92.

Most Recent Controversial/Visible School Issues:

Several new school board members were recently elected, and there may be major changes in the direction of the school district. For the present, however, the board has indicated that it will involve teachers in any changes related to the staff development program or the curriculum.

Description of the Community:

Tyrone is a small, rural, blue-collar community in central Pennsyivania. The community has a low tax base, and the aid ratio is .7400. Sixty percent of the students are in vocational programs and 40 percent are in the academic curriculum. Approximately 25 percent of the students go on to four-year colleges. Parents are basically satisfied with the education their children receive.

Overview

Re:Learning's concepts were introduced to Tyrone staff by the junior-senior high school principal after he attended an ECS meeting on RL in Baltimore, Maryland in the summer of 1988. After preliminary discussions with the faculty, administration, and board, Tyrone established in the early fall of 1988 an RL advisory committee and a larger working committee to explore the feasibility of engaging in RL. It was initially perceived that commencing the implementation of RL at the junior high might help Tyrone address specific student adjustment difficulties it had been experiencing with recent classes of seventh graders at the junior-senior high school. Accordingly, a seventh grade RL group, or team, was also formed in the fall of 1988.

The assistant superintendent headed the initiative at the district level and a teacher chaired the advisory and working committees. The seventh grade team was headed by the high school principal and vice-principal. Volunteer staff engaged in extensive exploratory, networking, discussion, and planning activities in both the 1988-89 and 1989-90 school years.

In 1990-91, a six-person seventh grade teaching team was formed and was provided common planning time to deal with the 110 students assigned to the team's care. The team's members focused on student-as-worker, engaged the students in several cross-curricular projects, and coordinated their lesson plans. Concurrently in 1990-91, the management of RL was turned over to the teachers; an eighth grade team was formed to undertake planning for 1991-92; the district took steps to merge the education of academic and vocational students; and RL was incorporated in the district's long range plan.

Projected activities in 1991-92 include: continuation of the seventh grade team activities, implementation of the eighth grade team, development of an RL high school humanities course, and additional pilot work on interdisciplinary approaches to instruction.

Leadership, Management, and Support

Tyrone's RL committee structure, the teacher coordinator's role, and the administrative and financial support for the initiative are described below. Reflections on the progress to date in expanding the shared leadership of RL are also cited.

Committee Structure

Tyrone's RL advisory committee (three teachers, four administrators, a board member, and a parent), although active early in the life of the initiative, has not met since mid-1990. In part, its function was subsumed by the district's RL working committee (17 teachers, 7 administrators, a board member, and a parent). The latter committee met in September 1990 to evaluate the progress made in RL during the previous year. It was scheduled to meet again at the end of the 1990-91 school year to assess progress and deliberate over proposed activities.

At the operational level, the group that was most active in defining RL at Tyrone was the seventh grade team (i.e., six teachers who worked closely with the assistant high school principal). The team met almost daily and was led by a teacher. The team dealt with scheduling, instructional, and interdisciplinary course development matters. Decisions were made by group consensus, and the team decided how the monies allocated to RL would be spent.

Teacher Coordinator's Role

In 1990-91, the high school assistant principal served as the coordinator for the school's RL initiative. The school's administration, however, recognized the need for "official" RL teacher leadership and worked in 1990-91 to lay the groundwork for a teacher coordinator in 1991-92. Accordingly, an official teacher coordinator will assume a leadership role early in the 1991-92 school year. She will teach four periods and have three periods in which to attend to RL coordination and team work.

Administrative Support

As was noted above, district central office and high school administrative staff played the leadership roles regarding RL through September 1990, after which, time teacher leadership was fostered.

The high school principal, who had taken the initial lead for RL, advanced the need at the end of the 1989-90 school year, for teacher leadership. He remained committed to RL though, and even shadowed a seventh grade student for a day in 1990-91 to get a better idea of how RL was being implemented by the seventh grade team. He attended at least one seventh grade team meeting each month and participated in most of the eighth grade team's planning meetings.

The high school assistant principal, who also worked closely with the seventh and eighth grade teams in 1990-91, served as the RL coordinator. She worked with the seventh grade team during the summer of 1990 to develop a schedule for their 110 students and participated in many of the team's meetings throughout the year. She indicated, as the year progressed, however, that it became clear to her that a teacher coordinator (TC) was needed. The transition to increased teacher leadership commenced in 1990-91. During the year, the principal and the assistant principal specifically involved two teacher leaders and the school's "voc-tech" director in deliberations regarding the direction that RL was to take in the district, in order to contribute to their capacity to play RL leadership roles in subsequent years.

Central office staff and the board continued to support RL, and were provided regular progress reports through established communication channels. The seventh grade team also conducted a progress report for the board in October 1990, and expects to submit a written report to the board in the summer of 1991. Several of the board members were reported to be particularly supportive of RL.

Financial Support

The district reportedly expended about $16,000 on RL this year, of which $14,000 was provided by the state. Approximately ten percent of the money was spent on substitutes to free teachers for the eighth grade team meetings. Another 20 percent was spent to support staff travel to participate in workshops/meetings (e.g., TREK travel and travel to state-sponsored teacher conversations). The remaining 70 percent was spent to cover teachers' time (e.g., participating in meetings/workshops, working on curriculum development, planning interdisciplinary units, setting up schedules). The bottom line, however, was that the teachers were authorized to control the money and spent it as needed. Overall, fewer trips were taken than had originally been planned.

Reflections

According to the staff interviewed (the principal, assistant principal, two teacher leaders, and the school's "voc-tech" director), teachers' involvement in the RL initiative was expanded as a result of the formation of the eighth grade team. Overall, it was estimated that about 20 of the school's 62 teachers were seriously involved in acting on RL's principles in some fashion. There was consensus that the beginnings of collegial decisionmaking in the school had been strengthened by the school's involvement in RL, particularly as the word spread that the decisions that teachers made were going to be respected by the administration. The principal also reported that the high school department heads, when asked this year to assist with writing the district's long range plan, were more open to cooperating with one another, were interested in discussing interdisciplinary course development, and wanted to be involved in deciding how district dollars were spent. He attributed their enthusiastic behaviors to RL's influence in the school.

Building Understanding, Commitment, and Capacity

In 1990-91, Tyrone made a concerted effort to both consolidate and expand the implementation of RL at the junior high level. The pilot RL activities of the seventh grade team were supported, and efforts were made to involve the eighth grade teachers in RL. The eighth grade teachers were first convened off-site for two hours after school in November 1990 to update them on the district's RL plans. Subsequent meetings, chaired by the future teacher coordinator, were held in January, February, and March 1991. One of these meetings was a full day, and the other two were afternoon meetings. From 8 to 12 eighth grade teachers attended the meetings. They were provided with information on RL, and discussed RL's principles, scheduling for 1991-92, and interdisciplinary course development. An eighth grade team composed of four core subject teachers was formed as a result of the above activities, and the team members proceeded with preparations for 1991-92.

To build understanding and acceptance of RL among the community and parents, the district submitted several articles to the local newspaper describing Tyrone's RL activities. For example, the seventh grade team's presentation to the board in October 1990 was written up in the local press. The seventh grade team and school administrators also met with the seventh grade parents as a group at the beginning of the year to explain the modification to the seventh grade program. Concerted efforts were also made during the year to maintain contact with the seventh grade parents and to respond to their concerns.

Additionally, significant district energy was devoted to developing an updated district long range plan (LRP) in 1990-91. RL was discussed at all of the LRP-related planning meetings conducted by the junior-senior high school principal. The "mission statement" and "belief statements" developed as part of the district's involvement in RL were incorporated in the LRP. The district's proposed RL activities were also included in the LRP: correlating the mathematics program between the junior and the senior high, developing an RL humanities course at the senior high, integrating the school's program for vocational and academic students, and expanding RL by grade level increments.

Concomitant with the above activities, the district continued to build staff capacity to implement RL. Given the focus on the junior high, the seventh grade team had first choice regarding district-sponsored staff development activities. All seventh grade team members participated in training on the Johnson and Johnson model of cooperative learning. Two seventh and two eighth grade team members participated in a workshop on developing thinking skills. The assistant principal and five teachers also participated in an RL TREK in October 1990, sponsored by the state of Delaware. There was consensus among the group interviewed that, "even more staff training was needed to make RL work at Tyrone, particularly training in team leadership and team building skills." It was stated that, "It's a false assumption to assume that teachers can work together (in the absence of training in group process and team building skills)."

Major Activities

Descriptions of the seventh grade team and related RL activities are provided below.

Seventh Grade Team

The seventh grade team was composed of the following teachers: English, science, social studies, mathematics, and special education. A sixth teacher helped out with mathematics part-time. The team worked in the summer of 1990 on scheduling and planning for the first nine weeks of school. The team members set up a schedule in which they each taught five 50-minute periods a day. They also had the freedom to arrange their daily class schedule with their 110 assigned students, independent of the bell or class schedule for the rest of the school. They had three back-to-back instructional periods to work with students in the morning and two in the afternoon. The team and students were also assigned to a separate wing of the building, to foster the cohesiveness of the group and to cut down on "transition time" between classes.

Additionally, all team members had common daily planning time during the fourth and fifth periods. However, they took turns covering a study hall (fourth period) during one of their allocated planning periods. Thus, each team member had nine planning periods a week, and all were available for common planning during the fifth period each day. During their common planning time, they discussed instructional matters, discipline problems, communications with parents, individual student's achievement, approaches to dealing with students, interdisciplinary projects, and collaborative work. During the fourth and fifth periods, the students participated in block-scheduled electives (i.e., art, music, physical education, home economics, computer literacy, study skills).

In the course of their classroom instruction, team members made explicit efforts to have students take responsibility for their learning, engaged students in cooperative learning situations, maintained high expectations for students, attempted to interrelate their lesson plans across the four major disciplines, and integrated the special education students into their classes with the assistance of the special education teacher. The team also assigned 30 low-functioning seventh grade math students to the same room and allocated three teachers to work with them on the school's John Saxon Math Series, a mastery approach which involves students teaching lessons, follow-up group study, and teachers working as coaches. Overall, team members closely monitored the students. When there were problems or disciplinary infractions, the team's approach was not to just punish; rather, the team explored ways of working positively with students to change their behavior.

The seventh grade team also engaged the students in the following mini-projects, which ranged from a few days to a few weeks in length.

- Students investigated and reported on the history and geography of Tyrone, the unique and common aspects of the school, and the culture of the community. The written and video-taped results were shared with the class and with a group of seventh grade students in Arizona who engaged in a similar activity.

- Students visited a local amusement park as part of a school "physics fair," and investigated the laws of physics involved in the various rides.

- Students visited a local environmental center and collaborated with Tyrone high school students on the conduct of several ecological study activities being conducted as part of an outdoor biology course.

- Students participated in a seventh grade spelling bee.

- Students participated in projects tied to the Governor's Energy Education Award. Over half of the seventh graders completed the required seven projects and earned the award.

- Students made presentations on goal setting and using one's mind well.

Each of the above activities was preceded by and/or followed-up with selected classroom work.

The interviewees noted that Tyrone was "at the point of classroom piloting some selected activities/projects in 1990-91, and that a lot of work remained to be done on developing interdisciplinary courses and coordinating instruction across classes."

Related RL Activities

Tyrone is a comprehensive high school with over 50 percent of its students taking vocational courses. A key administration and faculty concern has been how to merge or interrelate vocational and academic courses to the end of addressing Sizer's principles of intellectual focus and universal goals for all students. A step in that direction occurred in 1990-91. The 16 vocational staff members met with the members of the math department to begin to correlate junior and senior high math, and to include "voc-ed" related problems in the math courses. Five, two to three-person committees were formed to generate such problems.

Additionally, RL-related communications with the junior high parents were established, and preparations were made for an eighth grade team to commence activities in the 1991-92 school year (four core teachers, two or three other staff, and 120 students).

Effects of Re:Learning

The effects that RL has had to date on staff, students, and parents are described below.

Overall Staff Responses to Re:Learning

The future TC perceived that the staff involved in RL were more enthusiastic this year. She said, "There was some teacher involvement outside the academic environment, more nurturing between and among teachers, and more nurturing of students." She perceived that the staff, in general, were not threatened by RL and that the school's climate supported risk taking. The school's involvement in RL has "brought teachers out of their traditional role." She added, "We've been allowed to formulate the program with little interference from the administration. We feel important, it's our show, and we're running it."

The principal concurred with the above. He perceived that the teachers really enjoyed their new freedom and control over their work with students, scheduling, and the presentation of subject matter. He reported that those staff that have not been involved have not been negative or undermining of the initiative; rather, they have adopted a wait-and-see attitude. He also felt that the school's staff, in general, were much more receptive to assuming control over the school's efforts to change as a result of the RL initiative.

Student and Parent Responses

There was a common perception among those interviewed that the seventh grade students liked the changes that had been made in their classes, were more on task and excited by their learning, and particularly liked being more actively involved in learning (i.e., student-as-worker). The principal also

reported that the seventh graders, in comparison to other classes, experienced the lowest number of failures, the highest grades, and the fewest discipline problems. The TC said, "The seventh graders were not as bewildered (as previous classes) by the transition into the junior-senior high, due to the structural and program changes made as a result of RL."

Parent reactions to the changes made at the seventh grade were generally very positive. Reportedly, some parents were skeptical at the beginning of the year, because the word "RL" had a bad connotation. After a month, however, the parents were quite pleased. "Now, RL has a nice connotation to the people in town," the principal reported. There has been more communication with parents, and they feel they have a more open line to teachers than before. The principal added, "Parents say we like what you are doing with the seventh graders; they are not moving in the halls, and they are all in the same wing of the building." There was a common experienced-based perception among those interviewed that "parents feel their (seventh grade) children are being taken care of better." The positive parent responses were attributed directly to the work and attitudes of the seventh grade teachers. The assistant principal noted that the positive parent responses were "an unplanned promotional tool for the program and the school."

Enablers and Barriers

Conditions or factors that either contributed positively to or detracted from the implementation of the RL initiative as a whole are outlined below.

Enablers

Cited as enablers were: the support from the central office administration and the board empowering RL staff to take charge of the initiative and to experiment (e.g., placing three teachers in the at-risk math students' class); the "can-do" attitude of the seventh grade team (i.e., they did what was best for the students); the fact that Tyrone started RL at the junior high (i.e., the teachers were more willing to look at students as individuals, and to work with them in more depth than the average high school teacher would likely have been); and the fact that Tyrone has chosen an incremental approach to introducing RL in the school, instead of starting school-wide (i.e., a step-by-step approach was viewed as best or most workable).

Barriers

Among the reported barriers encountered were: some problems in the smoothness of the collaborative work of the seventh grade team, due to a personality conflict; concerns on the part of the "voc-ed" teachers regarding "how they fit into RL," which were resolved by including them in RL planning and staff development activities; and constraints on the formation of the eighth grade team (i.e., the team could not be set up as desired to parallel the extant seventh grade team) due to a lack of monetary resources. Regarding the latter issue, the principal commented, "It would be nice if the board would consider RL more directly in its budget (each year) and provide RL with sufficient funding to set up an eighth grade team structure identical to the seventh grade's structures (i.e., due to scheduling difficulties, having one

or two additional eighth grade teachers would have helped to achieve the desired team structure)."

Anticipated Activities

Proposed summer activities include: participation by five teachers in the Pennsylvania TREK (four will be "voc-ed" teachers); participation by four teachers in the state's RL curriculum development institute at Shippensburg; a possible team building workshop for RL staff; and curriculum development work by the seventh and eighth grade teams. Planned activities in the 1991-92 school year include: the continuation of the seventh grade team and the initiation of the eighth grade team; the implementation, each quarter, by the seventh and the eighth grade teams of a mini-project integrating the four core subjects; preparatory work for additional cross-curricular course development; experimentation with mini-exhibitions; the participation of a "voc-ed" teacher in teaching a career-science course to 16 seventh graders who are at risk of dropping out; and the possible development of a RL humanities course at the senior high level.

SUMMARY AND REFLECTIONS

This section presents a brief summary of the nine RL development sites' activities and successes in 1990-91. It also presents several issues for reflection; issues which have the potential to influence the sites' future progress.

Summary

Collectively speaking, the school sites that were engaged in their third year of RL made substantial progress in the following areas.

- Seven of the sites reorganized, or made preparations to reorganize, school schedules at one or more grade levels in order to provide core teams of four to five teachers with a common daily planning time, a common group of students, and back-to-back teaching periods.

- The staff at all sites modified, to varying degrees, traditional approaches to instruction in order to engage "students-as-workers," increase their active participation in learning, and get them to take responsibility for their own learning.

- All sites also worked on, to varying degrees, the development and/or piloting of interdisciplinary (cross-curricular) courses or projects in selected subject areas at selected grade levels.

- Several of the sites conducted "exhibitions" of student performance in selected subject areas.

- Several of the sites engaged staff in "advisory-type" activities with the students involved in RL.

- More than half of the sites made significant outreach efforts to selected groups of parents to inform them of the changes being made as a result of RL and to involve them in their students' learning.

- The great majority of the sites also engaged in summer curriculum development work, continued staff development in RL, made efforts to increase teachers' control over RL activities, and expanded, to varying degrees, the number of staff involved in RL.

Key enablers that were reported included the following.

- Almost all sites reported that the continued support of the central office staff and the board was a key enabler (i.e., comments like, "They commissioned us to do it (RL), and they want us to succeed," or "They gave the RL staff the control to design the school's RL initiative," were heard from several of the sites).

- At least three of the sites indicated that the structural changes they were able to effect facilitated their RL endeavors (i.e., revised

school schedules, students grouped with teams of teachers, reduced teaching loads and/or the provision of common planning time).

- Two of the sites stressed the importance of the staff development provided RL staff (e.g., curriculum development procedures, TREK training, team building).

- More than half of the sites directly or indirectly cited the enthusiasm, camaraderie, commitment and hard work of the teachers involved in RL as key enablers.

- A third of the sites indicated that the positive responses of students and parents to RL facilitated their efforts.

- Four of the sites reported that the support networks set up by the state and/or CES/ECS were particularly valuable (e.g., teacher/principal conversation meetings).

The critical barriers that were reported included the following.

- All sites reported that there continued to be resistance to RL from non-involved staff. The levels of reported resistance varied from minimal/moderate to strong. A sampling of the issues which disturbed non-involved staff at one or more sites included: fear of job loss, perceptions that RL staff received preferential treatment in the form of decreased teaching loads, selected instances of professional jealousy and/or competition over turf, perceptions by some non-RL staff that they were being forced to participate in RL-related activities (e.g., student advisories), perceptions that RL teachers are "out for glory," the normal fear of change, and continued mixed reactions to CES' nine principles -- particularly, teacher as generalist.

- Several of the sites indicated directly or indirectly that monetary resources were an issue (i.e., finding sufficient resources for extra staff positions to accommodate revised schedules, additional planning time, summer curriculum writing time, and staff development).

- At least three of the sites reported that making changes to the school's schedule to accommodate block scheduling and common planning time for core teams of teachers (and students) and/or interdisciplinary courses was a significant problem, due to the multiplicity of the courses the school offered and the availability of staff to teach them.

- More than half of the sites indicated directly or indirectly that "time" was a problem. That is, finding the time to "do it all" (e.g., teach, engage in curriculum development work, conduct student exhibitions, participate in RL planning meetings and staff development, and host visitors) constituted a significant continuing challenge.

- At least three of the sites reported that the level of the school principal's involvement in or support for RL was not "all that it might be."

- Four of the sites reported experiencing mixed messages from the central office which constrained their RL activities (e.g., continuing requirements to teach prescribed district curriculum and participate in district testing of that curriculum, to group students according to mathematics levels, and/or to return to a "normal" teaching load).

- Three sites reported experiencing communication problems that affected their RL work (i.e., a decrease in communications among the board, central office and the RL participants, and/or inactive districtwide steering committees).

The RL participants at some of the development sites generally reacted to non-participants' resistance to RL in 1990-91 in one or more of the following ways. They:

- maintained a lower profile (i.e., conducted fewer RL briefings, and put out fewer newsletters)

- worked hard at RL and made the assumption that their work would speak for itself and eventually be appreciated by others (non-participants)

- shared the credit for exemplary work with non-participants by having school visitors observe non-RL participants' exemplary classes as well as RL classes

- invited non-participants to specific RL events (e.g, off-site conferences, workshops, school visits, and teacher conversations)

- created RL subcommittees to increase opportunities for staff participation in RL-related decisionmaking.

The above summary (and the separate descriptions of each site's activities) suggests that the nine RL development sites made varying levels of progress in implementing their vision of RL. Each achieved specific successes, and each encountered particular barriers. Overall, at the majority of the sites, the leadership staff interviewed generally felt that they made the most progress in the areas of personalizing teaching and learning, engaging "students-as-workers," and modifying the climate or tone of the school (at least with regard to those staff and students involved in RL). All, explicitly or implicitly, acknowledged that a lot more work remained to be done in the areas of devising common/simple goals related to a limited number of essential skills and knowledge (i.e., "less-is-more," interdisciplinary courses, and projects), and developing exhibitions of students' mastery of the essential skills and knowledge. Similarly, all acknowledged that systematic work on Sizer's other principles also lay ahead (e.g., schoolwide intellectual focus, universal goals, teacher-as-generalist). Additionally, at most sites the RL staff were so involved in "doing it" that they did not have the energy to deal definitively with the issue of the resisters; that, too, lay ahead. Finally, the leadership staff interviewed (TCs and other staff) reported that it was their perception that the staff, students, and parents who were involved in RL in 1990-91 generally responded quite favorably to the experience.

Reflections

Based in part on Research for Better Schools' Inc. extensive years of experience with educational change initiatives, and in part on its three years of experience with Pennsylvania's RL initiative, the following reflections are offered.

Substantial progress has been made at most of Pennsylvania's RL development sites. The untiring commitment to RL of the RL staff at these sites is unquestionable. However, based on the information summarized in this report, we would like to raise several issues. These issues deal with the local organizational contexts being provided in support of RL -- specifically, they deal with (1) organizational commitment, (2) strategies for achieving the RL vision, and (3) resources. These issues are not new ones. All sites addressed them during their first year of planning. We, however, feel they need to be raised again, because from our perspective, how well they are addressed will affect the ultimate success of the initiative.

(1) To what extent are the leadership and staff at Pennsylvania's RL sites committed to realizing fully their vision of schoolwide change consistent with RL's nine principles? Have the leadership of the districts and schools communicated well, through both words and actions, their commitment to their vision of RL?

Although the staff interviewed at most sites reported that administrative and board support was an enabler, a close reading of the site descriptions reveals that there are varying levels of central office, board, and building-level administrator support and involvement in RL; varying levels of contact/communications among the central office, board, steering committee, and RL participants; and in some sites, administrative mixed messages. Additionally, there is some evidence in some of the site descriptions to suggest that leadership staff, particularly the district administrations and boards, may be treating RL as a "traditional" change effort (i.e., central office staff provide their endorsement of a new initiative, orient the board, participate in a few planning meetings and "new program" events, and periodically provide progress reports to the board), and may be underestimating the level of direct personal support and sustained "hands-on" involvement required to promote its success.

Given the above, leadership staff from each of the RL sites may want to take some time to reflect on their efforts over the past three years to determine where they stand regarding their vision of RL. They then may want to assess whether their current level of support and involvement in RL is sufficient to achieve fully their vision.

(2) Are the current strategies that districts and schools are following to realize their visions of RL capable of achieving that vision?

There is evidence in the site descriptions that most schools have adopted an incremental, volunteer-based, pilot strategy for achieving their vision of RL. Muncey and McQuillan (1991) suggest that this strategy is most apt to result in either modest change,

change that does not disrupt the basic structures and routines of the school, or in the development of a school-within-a-school, "a new specialty shop in the shopping mall of the comprehensive high school." They also concluded that the assumption by "vanguard" staff that "their work would speak for itself and eventually be appreciated and adopted by uninvolved school staff," was politically naive. (See the Appendix for a summary of Muncey and McQuillan's conclusions.)

The use of volunteer-based, incremental, pilot approaches to realize their visions of RL is not the real issue. In fact, the magnitude of their visions almost dictates that such strategies be used to initiate RL, to enable school staff to operationally define "it." There is a real danger, however, if Muncey and McQuillan's (1991) observations and conclusions can be generalized, that Pennsylvania RL sites may have trouble getting beyond this point unless further actions are considered. The real issue is, "To what extent have Pennsylvania's RL sites established a firm sense of the processes/strategies they will use/follow to achieve their visions and RL's ultimate goals?" As of last summer, only a few of the RL schools/districts had commenced activities to develop strategies that would take them from "voluntary participation" to "schoolwide implementation."

The problem of achieving consensus among a school staff and developing strategies to effect schoolwide change/reform is not new to RL. In that regard, it is unlikely that any school staff will ever reach total consensus on desired reform activities, particularly a reform of any magnitude. It is also well documented in the change literature (Rogers, 1971; Hord et.al., 1987) that school staff tend to fall into several categories with regard to their responses to the introduction of a school change initiative (i.e., innovators/early risk-taking adopters, leaders/cautious adopters, the early majority/cautious followers, the late majority/skeptics amenable to peer influence and administrative expectation, and resisters/opponents to change). The latter two categories of school staff (the late majority and resisters) typically constitute anywhere from 35 to 45 percent of a school's staff.

Considering the above, leadership staff and staff from each of the RL sites may want to reflect on alternative strategies for making the transition from a volunteer-based approach to RL to a schoolwide approach (e.g., the introduction of schoolwide RL-related activities required of all staff to provide them a "taste" of RL; the introduction of schoolwide structural changes to involve all staff in RL, if only initially in token ways; and/or consideration of the creation of formal school/district policies which address the issues of "if, how, and when" uninvolved or resistant staff will be phased into new initiatives).

(3) To what extent are the resources currently being provided to school staff adequate for implementing the strategy and achieving the vision?

There is some evidence in the site descriptions that teaching staff at the RL school sites are "spread extremely thin" with regard to their work load and the time that it takes to "do it all" (i.e., teach; plan lessons with their peers; counsel students; confer with parents; develop and pilot new curriculum; develop and pilot frameworks for student exhibitions; participate in internal and off-site RL communications, meetings, and staff development sessions; conduct presentations; recruit other staff; deal with developing problems; host visitors; engage in communication/marketing activities; and find time for reflection). The above work-load reflects the fact that the implementation of any new school intervention usually requires the expenditure of considerable extra time, especially in the first few years of the intervention. Additionally, the work-load is reflective of an observation made by Phil Schlechty (1989); that the Coalition and Re:Learning are on the "cutting edge of ignorance" in that the changes they are currently undertaking are of such a "magnitude" that they have no historical precedent in education.

Given the above, Pennsylvania's RL sites might want to ask themselves if their RL teaching staff and working committees are being provided with the resources and organizational structure required for success (i.e., planning, training, development, revision, communication, and reflection time). The resource issue is particularly critical for the tasks of leadership, team building, interdisciplinary curriculum development, and the development of alternative assessments.

In conclusion, it needs to be emphasized that the above issues are based on information collected from the RL sites, are reflective of RBS' extensive experience with educational reform/innovation, and are reinforced by the research of Muncey and McQuillan (1991). In raising them, we recognize that they represent concerns for which there are no simple answers, but which need to be revisited periodically as RL evolves. Our hope is that by highlighting them, local and state leadership will be encouraged to grapple with them in ways that strengthen Pennsylvania's RL effort and, indeed, the RL efforts of each site.

REFERENCES

Fiske, E. B. (1990). Seminar talk. Coalition of Essential Schools. Brown University.

Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Muncey, D. E., & McQuillan, P. J. (1991). Some observations on the possibilities of major restructuring in American schools: An ethnographic perspective. Working Paper #3, CES School Ethnography Project. Brown University.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: A status report. (1990, October). Harrisburg, PA: The Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Rogers, E. (1971). Diffusion of innovations. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1990a). Seminar talk. Coalition of Essential Schools. Brown University.

Sarason, S. B. (1990b). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. (1989). Remarks made at a Leadership Conference. Louisville, KY.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

APPENDIX

Summary of Muncey's and McQuillan's Conclusions

Muncey and McQuillan recently completed a five-year ethnographic study of several Coalition schools commissioned by CES (Muncey and McQuillan 1991). The major observations or findings presented in that report are cited verbatim below.

- Perhaps the most important point to be made is that in many of our (CES) study schools we have found there is no consensus that fundamental changes in school structure and/or teaching practices needs to occur.

- CES membership, by forcing the issue of what constitutes a school's philosophy, tends to reveal differences various faculty have concerning their job, the school's mission, and the best ways to educate students. Making a school's philosophy problematic for its staff tends to disrupt the fragile (usually unspoken and unquestioned) assumption that there is a sense of shared purpose, values, and belief underlying the everyday world of the school.

- The usual starting points for reform tend to be aspects of the common philosophy or agenda that individual teachers (or small teams of teachers) can do on their own, with little disruption to the school as a whole. For example, we have found that proponents of Coalition reform tend to begin in their own schools by emphasizing student-as-worker and personalization. Attempts to implement these practices by individual teachers or teams of teachers provide little disruption to the daily business of school. Furthermore, they can be and usually are done without faculty consensus (and often with minimal negotiation by the entire faculty and relevant others, such as the school board) concerning their appropriateness or representativeness as a school-wide philosophy.

- At most schools, a "vanguard" of faculty voluntarily come to embrace Coalition philosophy. While they may see themselves and be viewed by the administration as "harbingers of the future," these faculty are often perceived by their noninvolved colleagues as receiving preferential treatment within the school. Their efforts often end up dividing the faculty rather than providing examples or role models.

- Most Coalition supporters (particularly teachers) have been politically naive in their use of power, in their negotiations with their less interested colleagues, and in their expectations about what school change would require.

- The new divisions created within schools as a result of Coalition membership tended to restrict communication among the faculty. This, in turn, often meant that opposition built based on hearsay as well as actual developments. It was an outcome of the political naivete and it heightened political problems.

- There is an assumption that once a faculty has "accepted" a reform program, there is little if any need for the faculty to reflect on this decision in an ongoing fashion. In effect, planning for change seems to become defined as part of the start-up for change rather than part of an ongoing process of change.

In summarizing their findings Muncey and McQuillan (1991) wrote the following.

> Two findings are clear from our research: school change holds the potential to engender considerable tension within a school faculty. And, on top of all this, finding time and promoting the expertise to deal with these multiple concerns is expensive.
>
> Our research also suggests that an effort at major restructuring, like the Coalition, can be so compromised in practice that it becomes a piece of the school structure that it was intended to change rather than a "force" for change schoolwide. For instance, many of the earliest Coalition member schools accepted the criticism that their schools were like shopping malls (Powell, et al. 1985) -- and pro-Coalition faculty and administrators sought to change this. Yet, our evidence suggests that while many Coalition reform efforts are experiencing some success at becoming another specialty shop within the school, they have found it difficult to seriously challenge the school's current structure or practices more broadly.
>
> We do not intend to imply that our observations should ring the death knell for restructuring based on our research among a limited sample of the first Coalition member schools, although Sarason (1990a, 1990b), too, has raised concerns about recent educational reform efforts. We have been conducting research for nearly five years. Although this represents a substantial research period, we may need to keep in mind that American secondary schools have remained relatively unchanged -- in terms of their structure, predominant pedagogy, and disciplinary divisions -- for nearly 100 years. During this time these forces have become well entrenched. Creating change may take longer than the time framework we have employed allows us to observe (Fiske 1990; Schlechty 1989).
>
> Many lessons, some painful, still need to be learned. This certainly seems true at our study schools. While some things at these schools changed as the result of new efforts at restructuring, most schools appear resilient to schoolwide restructuring. There is little to suggest that other restructuring efforts will have more success without first seeking and obtaining widespread faculty consensus, establishing a sense of the processes that they will follow throughout the effort, increasing their awareness of the

likely obstacles they will encounter, and developing some sense for how everyone at all levels of the educational bureaucracy will be held accountable for the schooling of our children.

95